

The Consecration of the

MOST REVEREND

MATTHEW PARKER

Archbishop of Canterbury

Effected by the Rt. Rev.

ANTHONY KITCHEN

*called Dunstan; Monk of the Order of St. Benedict; sometime
Prior of Students at Gloucester College, and Abbot of Eynsham
thereafter Bishop of Llandaff*

J. C. WHITEBROOK

Barrister-at-Law, Lincoln's Inn

'Truth can never be told, so as to be understood, and not
be believed.'

BLAKE, *Marriage of Heaven and Hell.*

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LIMITED
LONDON AND OXFORD
MOREHOUSE-GORHAM CO.
NEW YORK



THE TYPOGRAPHY AND BINDING OF THIS BOOK CONFORM TO THE
AUTHORIZED ECONOMY STANDARDS

First published in 1945

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LIMITED, LONDON AND OXFORD
5157

AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION

TO essay fresh treatment of the Consecration of Archbishop Parker, after definite conclusion thereon reached by the Holy See, and after so much written by the learned, who have espoused opposite views upon the historical and doctrinal matters involved, might appear arrogant and hazardous, were it not, that the labours of those engaged in the calendaring and reproduction of historical documents constantly afford fresh material, and that, upon purely historical decisions heretofore attained, modern judgement may vary former verdicts, in the light of fresh evidence. To much fresh evidence, access has been provided for me by the kindness, and indeed by the suggestions, of opponents, who would not, in any way, consent to the views I have advanced; and it is a particular pleasure to recall in this direction the kindly and courteous encouragement given, long since, by the then Bishop of London, Dr. Frederick Temple, a great and understanding man, whose intrinsic goodness has too long suffered from emphasis laid upon the mannerisms of his masculine personality.

The fresh evidence presented in this essay is primarily that of Argall, and of the other registrars of Archbishop Parker. These testimonies were found in a place unexpected. The business of the registration of wills and the noting of administrations and of grants of probate attached in Elizabethan days, and, indeed, for centuries thereafter, in the vast majority of cases, to ecclesiastical courts, and to the registrars appointed by the ecclesiastical authorities. In the Province of Canterbury, the bulk of the wills of opulent persons were recorded in the registers of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. Of this court, the wills are collected in massive volumes, generally exceedingly well written and preserved, each volume dealing with a year's registrations, and receiving a name, selected from those of the testators included in the volume. Of the volumes, that termed 'Mellershe' is contemporaneous with the period of Parker's Consecration, and contains, in addition to other illuminations, an excellent miniature of Archbishop Parker, hereafter described. The preamble to the volume, common in other cases, is omitted, but a full title is to be found in a calendar to this volume, an ancient calendar, undoubtedly contemporaneous, which has for-

tunately escaped destruction, or mutilation. In it, Argall, Parker's registrar, has recorded the essential fact of the Consecration, and has indicated its date. His indisputable evidence in this, and in a number of documents, contemporaneous, and made, in the course of his duties, for immediate legal effect, leave no possibility of doubt that Parker was consecrated before the date heretofore assigned.

That erroneous date, December 17, 1559, is the date assigned by the Lambeth Register, a document, or rather collection of documents, purporting to be a chronicle of the acts of the Archbishop in his official capacity, and alleging as a witness of the incorrect date, amongst others, Argall. Of the Lambeth Register, no production was made until the reign of James I, and its veridical character has always been in dispute, chiefly for the reason so cogently stated by Wake, the forthright Hanoverian archbishop, that the handwriting of the volume throughout the period of Parker's episcopate, in which there were different and varied registrars (and clerks), is the same script. For those who wish to consider objections against the record of the Lambeth Register, based on other than this palaeographical ground, a perusal of the earlier criticisms, commencing with the *Letters on Anglican Orders* by John Canon Williams, may be commended. That author does certainly marshal against the register a series of facts intended to show that Parker was not consecrated at all. The hypothesis that he was consecrated, perhaps validly, by Kitchen does not seem to have occurred to him. The development of that hypothesis is possible for reasons that will constantly be stated in the following pages, and that are consistent with the Bull of His Holiness, the late Leo XIII, so often hereafter cited.

To propound this hypothesis, without offence to Catholics and Protestants alike, is of extreme difficulty. Whether the difficulty can be overcome is doubtful, but if herein there is a line that might seem of intentional insult to any Christian believer, or of slight or contempt towards any form of Catholic Faith honestly held by those outside Catholic communion, may the reader in greater charity, not merely forgive, but add his prayers for the forgiveness of the offender. In particular, the treatment of those Catholic bishops who survived the Marian days—to be deprived by her successor—may appear not to bear sufficient testimony to their consistency and sufferings. It would be futile for any seeking Catholic approval to undervalue these, but the following pages deal, not with the

sanctity, firmness in the Faith, or the excellent discharge of the great pastoral office of these bishops, but with the perspicacity and abilities of men, amid the force of the movements of the day, in statecraft and diplomacy in issues temporal, and with the bishops' human relations of affection and obligation to Englishmen, often their Protestant friends, engaged in coping with the ever-changing aspects of a religious revolution. To regard Guest as a shifty semi-Protestant, and Thirlby as a steadfast Catholic martyr, is to lose sight of the fact that they entertained nearly the same views on the vast mass of dogmatic teaching at issue, and that on the subject of the supremacy, Thirlby had early adopted with zeal the views later held by Guest, pragmatically. Of course, Thirlby regretted his earlier service in Henry's reforms, but the fact that he, Bonner, and Gardiner did embrace and defend those reforms, at a date when Barlow was writing against the Lutherans, may give pause to those who would regard any man as a wayward or venal apostate because he could not swim straight in a whirlpool.

Of all, Kitchen seems the most consistent of the bishops of his day; not necessarily because he cared for none of these things. He seems to have cared, intensely, for the Mass, the real centre of Elizabethan controversy. In his daily celebration, Kitchen may have found the vast spate of prayer, promise, and praise a sufficiency for the absorption of his entire spiritual energy, and, surely, a guide adequate for a blind old man, fumbling his way to God. Such a hope might exist, for him, personally, but would afford little clue to a motive for consecrating Parker. Can aught in his course of life give that clue? It is carefully hidden on the other hand. Indeed, for most Christian men, there is a secret spring of life, a cherished principle, or mayhap a burning love, that is wrapt up within him, and shared only with his Maker, a secret kept within the mind of God and His child. Let a man abandon that principle or that love, and he bids for the chance of numbering himself with those who wander for evermore. Sometimes the secret of the martyr, or the saint, can be surprised for all to behold. In Campion, it shouted, like the blare of a trumpet, to proclaim that he loved England, so that he desired death for her sake to win her for God.

In Kitchen's life there is no such self-revelation: his individual separation from human intercourse gives a most inadequate clue. Why should he have abandoned the others of the ancient hierarchy? White, the Marian Bishop of Lincoln, suggested that Kitchen was

touched in the head. There may have been marked eccentricity in much of his conduct. A recluse, who refuses to explain himself, who makes no answer when maligned, who seeks no vengeance on those who have despoiled and robbed him, and who dies in the utmost poverty (when he might have left a comfortable provision for his relatives), must surely be counted, at least, eccentric, at best, an uncomfortable sort of person, who possesses the cardinal fault of needing explanation.

A man who chooses a life of loneliness incurs great hazard—sometimes great reward. The wilderness is a place of temptation, and, it is not given to all who wander therein to be fed by God, to hear His voice at Horeb's cave, or view the Promised Land from Phasga's heights. It is littered with the bones of those who have perished therein, yet ardent; led by the ecstasies of intrepid souls to the far-off and desolate places of the earth, where, remote from man, they have sought communion with God alone. Their safer course would seem to have been to have journeyed with the company of saints. Yet, in the desert is fine gold, and a way that the eye of the vulture hath not seen, nor hath the lion's whelp trodden it. That is the way of wisdom and of understanding. Perhaps Kitchen found the track; at the journey's end.

J. C. W.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER

PAGE

AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION . . .	3
-----------------------------	---

I. MODERATE MEN . . .	13
-----------------------	----

Sec. 1. The Moderate Men of 1558 and Parker's Consecration . . .	13
--	----

Scope of the Argument. Religious position in early 1559. Parker a moderate. His dwelling in Marian days. Elizabeth's desire for moderation in change. Reformers' insults to her. The intransigence of the old hierarchy, inevitable. The singular position of Kitchen and Thomas Stanley. The possible defence of the former. Oglethorpe's compromise; the Coronation and his subsequent acts. Parker's choice of Tunstall as consecrator. Thirlby suspect by Catholics and Spaniards. Not 'excommunicated' by Church of England until 1560. His relations with Campion and with Parker and Boxall. William Walpole, Thirlby's ward. The strange case of Thomas Stanley. John Salisbury, Bishop of Thetford. Kitchen's career summarized. Sanders' statement that Kitchen consecrated Parker. Various opinions of Kitchen.

Sec. 2. Parker's 'Principal Registrar' and the Lambeth Register . . .	23
---	----

The Principal Registrar of Parker—and Pole; Anthony Hussey. The scope of the Argument of the Section, so far as it affects the Lambeth Register; Hussey not the writer of the account in that register. Hussey, a moderate Catholic. His relations with Pole. Aversion from the burning of Philpot. Hussey's lay offices and ventures. The Corps of Merchant Adventurers. Governor of the English Nations. Resignation of his registrarships. What he retained. Not Parker's principal registrar in December, 1559. Master of Chancery and Bacon's deputy. His manner of attestation at ecclesiastical functions. His will and his legatees. Bequest to Edmund Campion. The binding of Cranmer's register. Hussey's epitaph and that of his son.

II. THE DATE OF PARKER'S CONSECRATION; THE FALSE RECORD THEREOF IN THE LAMBETH REGISTER, AND THE TESTIMONY OF THOMAS ARGALL, AN ALLEGED WITNESS . . .	30
---	----

Sec. 1. The Alleged Witnesses to the Acts of December 17, 1559 . . .	30
--	----

The true date of Parker's consecration, and the testimony of Thomas Argall thereon. The presence of Hussey and Argall at a consecration on December 17, 1559, alleged by the Lambeth Register. Description of Argall in the Patent Rolls, of 1559. Argall's qualifications as witness. His experience. He three times mentions Parker's consecration, as prior to December 17th. The provenance of the documents attesting the date. The miniature of Parker enthroned. Concurrence of Walter Haddon in Argall's testimony. Attempt to alter Argall's record. Argall, a man of conscience and religion. His Catholic will and its expressions. Contrasts of the Probate Acts of the wills of Argall and of Hussey.

Sec. 2. Parker's Testimony to the Date of Consecration 35

Parker's testimony to the date of consecration. His knowledge and probity. The date the last Sunday in October, 1559. Varied documents that are consistent with that date and not with December 17th. Queen Elizabeth and the earlier date. Explanation of a document relative to the vacant See of Bristol. Some suggestions as to the cause of the errors in the Lambeth Register. The Parker Family Records described.

Sec. 3. The Parker Family Records and Machyn's Diary. Their Veridical Worth 39

The memorandum, partly, of date subsequent to Parker's lifetime. Not chronological in sequence. Part of the roll ascribed to Parker's hand. Even that part interpolated and amplified. The roll not a contemporaneous note, or a diary. The early portion probably veridical. Perowne on the 'second' hand. The purpose of the interpolations. Errors concerning dates of Parker's birth and entry at Cambridge. The manner of the record of his ordinations. Extraordinary error relative to Advent. Entries to be doubted, dated 1541, 1544. The entry of 1554 and doubts arising. The other Marian entries, and the difficulties of dating them correctly. Perowne's suggestions. Parker's controversy on the Marriage of Priests, against Martin. His metrical psalms. Error of date of Harley's episcopate. Evidence against contemporary record of events. The Wednesdays in March. Error as to the length of Parker's married life. The use of etc. to be suspected as the mark of forgery. The alleged record of consecration, not Parker's entry. The case against the veridical character of the roll, as a whole.

III. THE NATURE OF THE RITE USED AT PARKER'S CONSECRATION AND PROVED FALSITIES OF THE LAMBETH REGISTER 45

Sec. I 45

Parker's physical and mental qualities. His curiosity and knowledge. His understanding of the term 'Catholic Bishop.' His care for due jurisdiction spiritual. Case of Curwen. Not, he asserted, a mere State functionary. The influence of Thirlby on Parker. Margaret Blackwell, née Champion. Thirlby his model for imitation. Thirlby's part in procuring the declaration of the invalidity of the Edwardine Ordinal. Bishops consecrated under that form. Grindal's consecration. Parker's refusal to treat Coverdale as a bishop. Parker's preference for a legal form of consecration. His lukewarmness towards the new Book of Common Prayer. The balance of probability against the use of the Edwardine Ordinal in 1559. The Pontifical alone a legal form then. The use of the Pontifical still lawful. Parker's consecration intended to be demonstrably valid. Inference as to the Ordinal used. De Quadra's repetition of Cecil's assurance. Kitchen, selected a consecrating bishop for Parker, had deprived Edwardine bishops as invalidly consecrated. Parker's conversations with De Quadra and with Arthur de Cossé, Bishop of Coutances. A version of the Book of Common Prayer in Latin for Catholic readers. A second version for Puritan readers. No Ordinal in the Latin version. The Lambeth register again. Its account not written for men of 1559. Its egregious error, relative to the consecration of Curwen. That circumstantial account false and denied by Parker himself. The purpose of the falsification in the Lambeth Register, relative to Curwen. A deliberated attempt to forge evidence to prove Parker's predilection for the Edwardine Ordinal. Parker's choice of Tunstall as consecrator. Inference as to the rite pro-

posed. Inferences as to date and rite from the *Summaria Petitio*. Why Kitchen and Salisbury were not included among the bishops confirming Parker's status. The confirming bishops ordered to instal him, not to consecrate him. Aldrich's testimony thereon.

Sec. 2. Parker's Consecrator, and Consecration

54

Unpublished documents relative to Parker's consecration at the Vatican. No pronouncement by the Holy See upon the validity of Parker's consecration, at any time. His case differentiated from the cases of his titular successors. Bishop Gordon's case. The comments of H.H. Leo XIII thereon. Express reservation of the case of Parker in the Bull, *Apostolicæ Curæ*. The positions of Kitchen, Curwen, and Stanley. Oglethorpe. Accounts of the resignations or depositions of the old hierarchy not quite satisfactory. Machyn's Diary. His mistake as to Parker, Scory, and Bill. Machyn's possible acceptance of the report of consecrations at the Nag's Head. The entry relative to December 17, 1559, described. The forms of the 'Nag's Head Fable.' Its value considered. Wedderburn's account. The alleged consecration of Parker by a single bishop. Jewel and the consecration by a single bishop. Bishop Gordon's account of Kitchen's refusal to consecrate. The points of concurrence found among variants of the Nag's Head Fable. Inferences from Jewel's letter of November 2, 1559. Mis-translation of that letter. His testimony to Parker's consecration before November 2nd. Jewel's enforced opinions. Jewel, Searle, and Parkhurst. Jewel and Unction. The selection of the consecrator. Kitchen steadfast in resisting the changes in religion. Position adopted by Tunstall, Bourne, Poole, and Thirlby. Singular immunity of Sodor and Man from religious change. Absentees from the episcopate opposing religious changes. Tunstall, Poole, and Bourne amenable to pressure. Parker's special desire for Tunstall. The first neglect of Kitchen as apparently irreconcilable. Elizabeth's aversion from Thirlby. Its causes. The tender of the Oath of Supremacy to fourteen prelates on May 15, 1559. Froude's inaccuracy hereon. Five bishops specially treated on June 20th. Special leniency to Thirlby. Machyn's error regarding Kitchen's deprivation. Deprivation of Heath and Thirlby, July 5th. Kitchen negotiating by July 12th. De Quadra's account. Kitchen resumes episcopal attire. Thirlby seeks to see De Quadra. De Quadra's low opinion of the Catholic Episcopate in England. Kitchen's compromise. His letter to Elizabeth, July 18, 1559. He declines the Oath of Supremacy, but is willing that others should take it. The Letters Patent to elect Parker as archbishop issued the same day. Lamb's opinion thereon. The curious repository of Kitchen's letter to Elizabeth. Kitchen to administer the Oath to Parker. Kitchen's position as consecrator the only reason why he was not deprived. The meaning of et cetera. Parliamentary discussion upon et cetera. The election of Parker. Ralph Jackson and the statement of the Lambeth Register. Parker's hopes of four bishops on September 9, 1559. Tunstall's name alone on the draft Assent for consecration. The names added to the four legally required. Elizabeth's denial of Barlow's and Scory's consecrations; October 26, 1559. The statutes that controlled the consecration of Parker. The mystery of Curwen's position. Kitchen's addition to the significavit a necessity of law. The spurious document of December 6, 1559. Tunstall's failure to comply within due time. His confinement on September 27th. He wavers on October 2nd. Position hopeless on October 5th. Bourne and Poole follow Tunstall's lead. Their deprivation of Kitchen's fresh position. Oglethorpe's survival in favour. Barlow's claim to episcopal status. Bale of Ossory. Hodgkins and his deprivation by Grindal. Surviving suffragan bishops of 1559. Elizabeth presses for immediate compliance with the order to consecrate. The peremptory order of October 26th. Cecil emphasizes that Barlow was unconsecrated. So also Scory.

No mention of delay of the consecration from October 26th onward. Parker forthwith empowered to act legally as consecrated archbishop. Grindal, proxy in Parliament for Kitchen. Grindal and Coxe. Their consecration. Kitchen as Archbishop of Llandaff. The writ for the consecration of Jewel, addressed to the Archbishops. The probable assistants at the consecration of Parker. Salisbury and Bale and their preferments. The lot of Coverdale and Hodgkins. These latter not recognized as possessing episcopal functions fully, by Parker or Grindal.

IV. CONTEMPORANEOUS WITNESSES TO THE REAL FACTS OF PARKER'S CONSECRATION, BY KITCHEN . . .

75

The inductive hypothesis explains historical fact. Omission of mention of consecration in the *Summaria Petitio*. When 'consecration' is omitted from documents, then also Kitchen's name is omitted. The Royal Assent to consecration quoted in the *Summaria* not that contained in the Lambeth Register. A possible Royal Assent not now to be found. The commands to Salisbury and Bale, as well as to Kitchen. Parker acted as Archbishop consecrated between October 29th and December 17th. Assumed the Pallium in November. The grant of arms. Champney's early explanation of the correct use of the title archbishop-elect by Parker. Parker's function as archbishop in tendering the Oath to Dr. Boxall, and in depriving him. Dr. Boxall's position and character. Grindal's letter of late March, 1575. Parker's strange reply. Jewel asked to produce the Register of Consecration. Harding suggests the name of Kitchen and insists on the necessity of three bishops and confirmation by the Holy See. The 'apostate' bishops. Kitchen described as a true bishop but false man. Jewel's evasive reply to Harding. Curious slip of Courayer as to Parker's consecration in the days of Edward VI. Consecration, by one bishop, defended by Jewel. Jewel's ordination as priest. The high character of the 'apostate' bishops. The surviving suffragan-bishops of the old succession. Sanders and the sources of his information. His report to Cardinal Moroni. That report favourable to the validity of Anglican Orders in 1559, 1560, 1561. Sanders' doubt as to Kitchen's position. He had not been reconciled to Rome. He had consecrated the Elizabethan bishops. Queen Elizabeth's inducement alleged, by Sanders, to have persuaded Kitchen to consecrate Parker. He also consecrated 'all those others.' Grindal and Coxe covered by Sanders' phrase. Parker's scrutiny of his opponents' writings concerning his consecration. Parker in communication with De Quadra upon the matter. His reticence when conversing with Arthur de Cossé. Reasons for reticence. The irregularity of his marriage. Suspected by Puritans. Every prospect of religious peace in 1590-1615 dependent upon the allegation that Coverdale and the like consecrated Parker. Froude's description of the Elizabethan bishops, and Elizabeth's purpose in the creation of them.

V. THE ATTEMPTS AT REUNION, AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE . . .

89

Difficulty of recording the events. The Spanish documents. Alvarez de Quadra. His capacity, opportunity, and tolerance. His false estimates of Elizabeth, Cecil, and Leicester. His letters to Philip not always delivered. Froude and De Quadra. Froude's false estimate of Elizabeth. Parker's opinion of her, contemporary and well-informed. Froude's treatment of the Elizabethan establishment. A vindication of Elizabeth's sincerity and logical acumen. Her advisers in 1559. The value she attached to ceremonies. The religious settlement and its stability under a Catholic successor. Suppression of the will of Henry VIII by Tunstall, Cecil, and Parker. The purpose of the 'religious traffickings' with De Quadra. De Quadra's reasons for haste. The offer of March 25, 1561. Parker's demand

for written minutes. De Quadra's proposals. Cecil's assertion of the validity and canonicity of Parker's episcopate. Cecil's demands relative to the title, 'Defender of the Faith.' The reason. Horne and Cecil's treatment of him. De Quadra's ultimatum. His death. De Quadra's ignorance of any facts such as are recorded in the Lambeth Register. The inference. De Quadra and the position of Horne. The facts of Horne's consecration. Perceval's error thereon. Jewel and the correct date. The alleged consecrators incorrectly described. Curious letter of Parker to Grindal at the time of Horne's consecration. Hussey, dead many months, appoints a deputy at the proceedings. The decree of the Convocation of 1562. Its obscurity. Guest consecrated 'with the usual customs.' Parkhurst consecrated 'according to the modern use of the Church of England.' The consecration of Dr. Hugh Jones, 'Archbishop of Llandaff.' Parker's difficulties with the Convocation. His unfortunate weakness. The results of the use of an Ordinal pronounced invalid. Bonner's utilization of the position. Tendering of the Oath of Supremacy. Death penalty upon a second refusal. Curious exemptions of men like Kitchen. Parker points out the danger to Cecil. He forbids the bishops to tender the Oath, without Metropolitan sanction, a second time. Horne tenders the Oath to Bonner. He denies the episcopate of Horne. The decision of the Judges that the facts of election and consecration could go to a jury. Horne not aided by Parker. Stapleton's statement of Bonner's contention. Stapleton's overstatement. Bonner's Counsel, Plowden and Wray. Lovelace, Parker's official. Their conjoint opinions adverse to the legality of Horne's consecration. Desire of Elizabeth and of Parker in this matter. Elizabeth's refusal to ratify the decree of Convocation by an Act. The final enactment relative to Reformed consecrations. The Pontifical left a legal form. Rogers asserts that it was used in the reign of James I. Elizabeth's characterization of the hierarchy as 'hedge-priests.' Protestant protest against the new Act in the Lords. Parker's silence. His subsequent conduct. Parker's decaying health. His end.

VI. THE DEATH OF KITCHEN, AND THE EVENTS THAT BEFELL LLANDAFF

106

Sec. I. The Summary of what follows in sec. 2, or is contained elsewhere concerning Kitchen's life

106

The tolerance towards Kitchen and to Sebastian Westcott compared. The orthodoxy of that Catholic priest avouched by Sanders. The charges brought against Kitchen by Church historians. The plundering of his see. Kitchen neither enriched, nor inconsistent. His inexplicable promotion by Henry VIII. The record of Cranmer's Register. Kitchen's abnegation of revenge in Marian days. He protects harassed Protestants. Rawlins White's testimony concerning him. Hooper's case. Appointed to declare the nullity of Edwardine consecrations. Not reconciled to Rome by Pole. Return to Parliament to protest against religious changes. His insularity. His country-bred mind. The lesson of the Wars of the Roses. His parochialism. Not excommunicate. Remoteness of Llandaff. His attendance in the House of Lords recorded after his death. His report to the Council on his clergy. William Evans obtains the Episcopal Register, and its record of Kitchen's Popish delinquencies. The failure of the Reformation to affect the diocese immediately. Roman Catholic clergy who drew the tithes. No Protestants in some parishes. Roman Catholics appropriate burial ground.

Sec. 2. The Death of Kitchen, and the Events that befell Llandaff

III

Inexplicable facts not to be dismissed. Inferences of causes for toleration of Kitchen's Popish practices. Kitchen's aims in anarchy. A legend of his days at Llandaff. Kitchen and beer. William Evans, LL.B. His church at St. Tathans. His aversion from fornication in 1547. Kitchen's aversion from the marriage of the priesthood. Removal of Smith from the Chancellorship. Smith's character. Kitchen plundered and ignored by Somerset. The Royal Commission of Jurisdiction in 1547. Gardiner and Bonner. Kitchen's loophole for evasion. He holds the Bishop's Courts without Royal authority. Excommunication of Robert Davies. Kitchen's conduct reported to the Court of Star Chamber. Evans' reply to the Bill. The Sheriff breaks up the Episcopal Court. Local plunderers of the see. Daily Mass in the Cathedral continued without break. Forceful final plunder contemplated in 1553. The articles taken. Dr. Smyth's theft of the seal. His forgeries of 'Kitchen's' deeds. Button, the Bishop's Secretary, and William Griffiths, Smyth's coadjutors. Geoffrey, bear-leader to a false Messiah. Griffiths whipped at Bedlam, in Elizabethan days. Kitchen's amicable relations with his clergy. His failure of sight. His journey to London. Return to Llandaff in 1563. His failure of mental vigour in August. The case of William Dawkins. Theft of a corpse. Sequestration of Dawkins, in 1562. Evans and Parker meet in August, 1563. Parker borrows Evans' seal. Curious document. Parker's possible visit to Kitchen. Discrepant dates to which Kitchen's death has been assigned. Parker's commendation of Evans' purity of faith. The spiritual administration of Llandaff entrusted to him. Grindal's remonstrance concerning Evans. Suppression of Kitchen's will. The long vacancy of the see. The Inventory of his goods. Their paucity. Monk's Court confiscated. Burial at Matherne. The worst and the best that can be said of Kitchen. Evans and John Griffiths. The contest for Kitchen's Register. Evans' ruse to obtain it. Attempts of Cecil's enemies to obtain the Register. Evans resists. His scurrilous remarks relative to his opponent. His Papistry. His naive declaration that he had ceased Papistry recently.

THE CATECHISM OF PROOF

130

MATTHEW PARKER

CHAPTER I

MODERATE MEN

1558-1563

What of the night? The night is full, the tide
Storms inland; the most ancient rocks divide;
Yet some endure, and bow not head nor knee.

Couldst thou not watch with Me?
Since thou art not as these are, go thy ways,
Thou hast no part in all My nights and days,
Lie still, sleep on—as such things be;
Thou couldst not watch with Me.

SWINBURNE, *A Wasted Vigil*

SEC. I

THE MODERATE MEN OF 1558 AND PARKER'S CONSECRATION

[The following chapters touch upon one of the most debatable matters of history—the origin of Anglican Orders. For readers whose acquaintance with the controversy is limited, this much may be said: Anglicans maintain that Archbishop Parker, the first to occupy the See of Canterbury after the death of Cardinal Pole, was consecrated on December 17, 1559, by Barlow, a bishop who had conformed to the changes of the Reformation since the days of Henry VIII, by Scory, a bishop consecrated in the days of Edward VI, by Coverdale, and John Hodgkins, the Suffragan-Bishop of Bedford. The consecration, purported to be so effected, is recorded in the Lambeth Register, a muniment that has been alleged to be of doubtful authority, and in a further document, alleged to be Parker's memorandum, preserved at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Catholics deny the validity of the form used at the consecration, as detailed in the register mentioned, that form being chiefly extracted from the Ordinal of the reign of Edward VI, used subsequently to the publication of the First Prayer Book of 1549, and deny also the status of all the bishops concerned, save Hodgkins.

The general purport of the chapters impugns the records of Parker's consecration, but alleges, his consecration at an earlier date, the use of the pontifical thereat, and a consecrator other than those recorded in the Lambeth Register. From the historical facts established, there is no attempt to deduce any inference relative to the continuance of an apostolical succession in those who followed Parker in the See of Canterbury.]

THE closing months of the reign of Mary were occupied by the apprehension of coming change, and by preparation for it, both by the lay peers (many of them professional profiteers in religious

revolution) and by the mass of the English clergy, then, as always, concerned with the untroubled reliance of simple souls upon God. The extent of the changes was determined, partly, by the necessity of filling the very large number of sees that became vacant by death; thirteen in all in January, 1559, if Jewel's letter to Peter Martyr, on the 26th of that month, is accurate in its computation. In particular, the See of Canterbury fell to fresh appointment. Cecil had determined his choice prior to the first week in December, 1558, that is, in the first fortnight of the new reign.¹ Parker had nearly every qualification that Cecil could desire. His solitary lapse from prudence—a complicity in the plans that would have put Lady Jane Grey on the throne—was unknown to Elizabeth's closest advisers.² His known connection with the interests of Elizabeth had been ancient. He had received the last message of Anne Boleyn, and her commendation of her infant child had been to him.³ His moderation during all change had enabled a friendship to subsist between him and the Catholics whom it was desired to placate. He had lived, in peace, in Thirlby's diocese throughout Marian days.⁴

Not that any immediate revulsion to the conditions of the end days of Edward VI was apprehended. Such a dread, if it existed, was tempered by knowledge of the character of Elizabeth, and by the ascertained wish of the majority of the English people: a wish, if not for Catholicism 'Papal,' yet, certainly, for a conservatism of religious practices to which the desires of the extremists of the reforming party were utterly alien. That majority was Catholic, regarded the Mass as the centre of Christian unity—ambassadors asserted it, Protestant reformers confessed it.⁵ Further, Elizabeth's counsellors had every reason for the maintenance of religion in form like to the old. Great rebellions, such as no sovereign, fresh to the throne, could contemplate with equanimity—the Pilgrimage of Grace and the Western Rising—had left survivors, strengthened in the Faith by memories of suffering. These rebellions had been encountered by princes with established title to the throne. Elizabeth had been declared 'bastard,' her title postponed to that of Lady Jane

¹ *Parker Society, Parker*, p. 49. At first, Parker hesitated. Negotiations were opened, with reference to Wotton and Abbot Feckenham; then an order was issued to Parker, for which see Hook's *Lives*. That Feckenham should have been considered a moderate, of Parker's sort, is interesting.

² *Parker Society, Parker*, p. 59. He was apparently suffering from hernia, incurred whilst in flight with Lady Jane's partisans. His admirers represented him as in flight from Papist persecution, for which see Hook's *Lives*.

³ *Parker Society, Parker*, pp. 59, 400. ⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. ix, 391. ⁵ Jewel's Letters of 1559, *passim*.

Grey, by the very reformers¹ who were awaiting their opportunity to emulate the deeds of Knox in Scotland. She had, what her father and her brother had not, a dangerous rival living, the Queen of Scots, a woman of ability, and not yet stained by the charges later levelled against her. All these factors weighed in the counsels of Catholics and of Moderates, unwilling to disturb the system of the Church in England by violent changes.

For the surviving bishops, the choice was, in most cases, compulsory. By their decisions, Ferrar,² Hooper, Latimer, and Ridley had suffered death, rather than accommodate themselves to fresh professions of religious belief. The example of their opponents hampered the Marian bishops. Further, nearly every one of them had, at some time or other, formally acknowledged the Supremacy of English kings, in terms that derogated from the Papal Supremacy. Every one of them, save Kitchen,³ had formally sought confirmation of his position from Pole, a Papal legate, and as formally accepted Papal Supremacy. A third change would have been exceedingly difficult to justify, and, further, would have been utterly repugnant to their informed conscience. 'Nearly' every one of them, be it noted, for two of the Marian survivors must be accounted excepted: Thomas Stanley, the Bishop of Sodor and Man, and Kitchen. Kitchen alone of the English bishops had preserved some measure of consistency, and might, with the like consistency, have accepted the Supremacy of Elizabeth, as he had that of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary. For some reason (perhaps the empirical teaching of the history of twelve past years), he boggled at the Supremacy of Elizabeth. He would not take the Oath, although he was willing that others should, as he carefully explained in a letter that will be quoted later.

Such a position, had it been founded upon considerations of expediency, like to those that enabled Cecil to remain in the counsels both of Mary and of Elizabeth, would not need ethical justification; it would belong to a political system in which moral considerations have no part. But, Kitchen's scruples were of conscience, alleged.

¹ John Hodgkins, Bishop of Bedford, had disputed Elizabeth's title in an address at Paul's Cross, in support of the project for Lady Jane Grey. See the *Greyfriars' Chronicle*, sometimes known as *Bavarde's Chronicle*, under date 1553; *Camden Society*, Vol. 53. His sermon of July 2nd was followed by Ridley's. That wise bishop used the term: one of the few unchivalric acts of his career.

² Ferrar had recanted once, but that was very early in his career.

³ Llandavensis, reconciliato sub Maria regno, solus dicitur confirmationem a sede Apostolica non postulasse (Sanders to Cardinal Moroni, Vatican. Archiv. Arm. lxiv, Vol. 28, ff. 252-274).

It is temerarious to explain the undeclared recesses of another's conscience, but, probably, Kitchen relied on the distinction ordinarily made between the speculative and the practical judgement. He believed the Papal Supremacy historical and desirable, but did not deem the rejection of it, by another, such a violation of Christian principle as would entail the severance of Christian unity. Even in his octogenarian old-age, he possibly hoped to survive for another swing of the escapement. His function was that of the pawl, to help the change back; he was no linn-block, such as Bonner, to resist all future slide.

Such considerations must have weighed in the minds of men like Oglethorpe, Tunstall, and Thirlby, all nowadays, by reason of their decision, rightly accounted Catholics; of Hussey, Argall, Pole's registrars, and of the Blackwells and Campions, City officials, Thirlby's hosts and relatives.

Oglethorpe, the Bishop of Carlisle, separated himself from his colleagues, distinctly. He crowned Elizabeth. But Bonner lent him the vestments for the occasion; the monks of Westminster looked down on the ceremony from the triforium¹—an act that must have had the concurrence of Feckenham. Hook states that Oglethorpe would even have consecrated Parker, had the act taken place in the Diocese of Carlisle.² In any case, he died, not removed from the Royal favour. He was left his property, as his will of November, 1559,³ sufficiently indicates. He was granted the Royal pardon for all offences against the Statute of Provisors, committed in the legatine days of Pole, and from all the penalties of Praemunire. He was able to endow his newly-founded school at Tadcaster, and to furnish it with the image of Christ over the door, and to provide for it as schoolmaster, a brother, Andrew. He was no irreconcilable.

Tunstall, who had accommodated himself, grudgingly and unwillingly, to the changes of Henry VIII and Edward VI, vacillated in matters of moment, in the summer of 1559. He protested against the operation of the Royal Commissioners in his diocese, not upon principle, not by denial of the Royal Supremacy, but on the grounds of the extent of the changes contemplated, within the Church fabric.⁴

¹ Father Seigebert Bulkeley, quoted by Rev. F. G. Lee, *The Church under Q. Elizabeth*, p. 12.

² Oglethorpe's house and chapel were in Chancery Lane, probably close to the existing 'Mitre' Public House.

³ 29 Mellershe

⁴ Letter to Cecil, D.S.P.

Of Tunstall's acquiescence in the new order, both Parker and Cecil had hopes, freely expressed. On October 2, 1559, Cecil wrote to Parker, 'The contents of your yesterday's letters I have imparted to Her Majesty and others of Her Majesty's Council. It is much liked the comfort ye give of the Bishop of Durham's towardness. It is meant if he will conform himself, that both he shall remain bishop and in good favour and credit.' In accordance with practice, Parker was permitted to nominate the bishops who should officiate at his consecration, and the one named first on the list was Tunstall. Strype, who saw the draft of the Regal Assent in the State Paper Office, affirms that, in his day, no other name appeared but that of Tunstall, placed there in Parker's writing.¹

Thirlby, from whom complaisance, greater than that of Tunstall, might have been expected, turned out, to the surprise of the Spanish ambassador, a staunch Catholic.² He was the son of John Thirlby, and his wife, Joan Campion. The father was Town Clerk of Cambridge, and the widow Joan long had a house there. It was in Cambridge, in Thirlby's Diocese of Ely, that Parker lived during the reign of Mary, in peace, but deprived, after some months of doubt, of his livings and deanery. What protection or hospitality he received, he repaid amply to Thirlby. From 1563, when he came, 'an uninvited guest,'³ but welcomed, to dwell in Parker's house, until his death in 1570, Thirlby remained the object of care to a Government that could always account him an enemy to Spain. Indeed, the Spanish Ambassador speaks not only of Thirlby's bias against Spain, but of his differences in religion from the Spaniards, at this period of change. 'Vexed with losing pensions, and this, together with our different views in religion, causes genuine enmity' is the opinion expressed.⁴

Prior to 1563, and during the sojourn in the Tower which followed Thirlby's 'excommunication' in 1560, Parker had sent to him a boy, whom he describes as a 'querister,' not improbably William Walpole, Thirlby's ward, long resident with him. This boy, whose only possible 'querister duties' could have been to serve Thirlby's Mass, was transferred to Bekesbourne, when Thirlby took up his lodging in the various archiepiscopal palaces. He was a musician, a rider of great horses,⁵ a swimmer (therein like Gardiner,

¹ Strype's *Parker*, I. i. 106. ² De Feria to Philip II, Apr. 29, 1558, *State Papers (Simancas)*.

³ *Parker Society, Parker*, p. 193. ⁴ Alvarez de Quadra to Philip II, Aug. 18, 1559.

⁵ See will of Boston, last Abbot of Westminster, 38 Populwell.

a jovial diplomat)¹ who could toss off a flagon of ale to toast the loss of Calais—which, again like Gardiner, he viewed as an ever present danger to English peace.

Sometimes, whilst he dwelt with Parker, the Archbishop was forced into the farce of searching for Papists in his household, with a simulated indignation like to that of John Silver denying his knowledge of the presence of Black Dog. 'Papists do you say, my lad? Let me find them!'² He had no need to find them. He had merely to convene his Court of Audience, and arrest the Registrar.

Fellow-prisoner with Thirlby was John Boxall, a member of Mary's Council, specially commended by Cecil as a 'wise man,' too wise to be at large.

The possession of these prisoners was of the utmost use to Cecil. They could always be incorporated in the hierarchy, in case of a reaction towards Catholicism. Thirlby had been separated from the Church in England with difficulty. To the last, he would not refrain from preaching. He was spared, in goods, even as Thomas Stanley was spared in all, from motives of policy.

The survival of Thomas Stanley in the episcopate was one of the strangest features of the Elizabethan change. He had been intractable in the days of Henry VIII, and Henry Man had been consecrated to the See of Sodor,³ which he does not seem to have visited with any frequency. Farrar is also said to have signed himself as Bishop of Sodor in the days of Henry VIII,⁴ and there may thus have been three claimants to the title. Gams, who includes Stanley in his list, as the last Catholic Bishop of Man, is inaccurate, according to Stubbs, who denies that Stanley was, in fact, Bishop of Man in the days of Henry VIII, and finds a fourth competitor. Stanley was certainly bishop there in the time of Mary. The Act of Uniformity, 1559, was not expressed to include the Isle of Man, and the Oath of Supremacy could not legally have been demanded from Stanley, there. This legal point does not seem to have been taken. Neither was the Oath tendered to Stanley, nor did he conform to the new ritual, or use its liturgy, upon occasions when the old seemed

¹ The alleged portrait in the Chapter House, Westminster Abbey, is a Victorian work of fancy. That mentioned in the *D.N.B.* is of Goodrich, not of Thirlby.

² Guzman de Silva to Philip II. He relates a private conversation between Parker, Thirlby, and Boxall: one of whom was presumably his informant. Cecil had placed de Silva in correspondence with Parker. Cal. State Papers (Spanish), Nov. 1, 1567.

³ Rymer's *Foedera*. xv. 86, Consecrators: Thirlby, Chetham, Lewis Thomas. Henry Man died Oct. 17, 1556.

⁴ Browne Willis, *Survey of the Cathedrals*, i. 367. This is the Robert Farrar, Bishop of St. David's, 1548.

preferable. As Rector of Wigan, he must have accounted himself in some fashion an official of the Church of England, as reformed by Elizabeth. The difficulty of dealing with Stanley was great. He was a bastard scion of the house of Derby, who claimed the nominations to the See of Man. Parker solved the difficulty by ignoring him, as far as possible. In the official list of the dioceses of the Church of England, compiled by Parker, and prefixed to Jewel's *Apology*, Sodor and Man is omitted. Pilkington wrote to Parker, in the 1560s, and mentioned that he had news of Stanley, who was living (probably in one of his numerous benefices), 'as merry as Pope Joan.' He ceased to trouble Reformers about 1568, and with him went the last of the Marian hierarchy who continued to occupy an English see.

His successor, John Salisbury, was, however, a prelate of the old order. He was consecrated to the Suffragan-Bishopric of Thetford, as early as 1535, became Dean of Norwich, and exercised his episcopal functions in that diocese and for the neighbouring Diocese of Lincoln. He does not appear to have visited the Diocese of Sodor and Man during his episcopate. He continued to hold the Deanery of Norwich, *in commendam*, and died in the city in September, 1573. John Salisbury, sometime Benedictine monk of Bury St. Edmunds, may thus vie in claim with Stanley to the title of the last bishop of the old hierarchy to occupy a see of the Church of England. He was not in any way an extremist, had, in early years, tampered with that section of the reforming party of which Delabere was a disreputable leader, and, thereafter, showed no inclination to associate himself with aught but the regular performance of his religious duties.¹ He was, evidently, of the number of Parker's friends, probably owing to his residence in Norwich, where Parker had been born, and had lived.

Salisbury was an old acquaintance of Bishop Kitchen of Llandaff, and of Tunstall, who both had acted with moderation towards the 'Oxford heretics' in Wolsey's day.

Anthony Kitchen, alias Dunstan, had been born, probably at Dunston, near Bolsover, in 1477, of a fairly well-to-do-family. In 1491, he appears on the Grace Book, Beta, of the University of Cambridge; in 1493, became Bachelor of Canon Law, and remained at Cambridge until, at least, 1495. He was thirty years of age when he said his first Mass at Westminster Abbey, as a Benedictine monk.

¹ His will bequeaths all his goods save two gowns to his 'wife,' Jane Barrett, 30 Peter, P.C.C.

thereof. In 1522, he was, for a second period, at Gloucester College, and succeeded Barton as prior of that Benedictine Oxford seminary in 1528. He collaborated, with tact, patience, and success, in Tunstall's investigation of the efforts of Garrett, Delabere, and other Oxford students to import books of reforming tendency into the University. It was at this time that Kitchen must first have met Salisbury.

In 1530, when Bachelor of Divinity of Oxford, Kitchen was appointed by Longland to be Abbot of Eynsham, the foundation which he steered through the troublesome days of the Pilgrimage of Grace and the dissolution of the Lesser Monasteries with skill, but less than his usual discretion. His complicity in the Northern Rising was suspected. He was tried, not on that suspicion, yet, for treason, by a commission over which Sir Simon Harcourt presided, and the charges involved not only Kitchen, but Sir Thomas Elyot and the Abbot of Osney. The charges amounted to riotous assembly, with the purpose of withstanding the King's writ, and hasty words indicating that intention. He was found, not guilty; but that he had used expressions, that discriminated between hearing the King's commands and obeying them, there is little doubt.¹ At the dissolution of the Greater Monasteries, he surrendered the Abbey on terms advantageous, alike to himself and the monks, returned to Gloucester College, and at this period became Doctor of Divinity.

In 1543, he counselled Robert Serle, who was at this time engaged, with Gardiner, in an attempt to procure Cranmer's downfall. The matter of the Heretics of Kent is fully related in the State Papers. In 1545, he was appointed Bishop of Llandaff, and was consecrated by Thirlby, Lewis ap Thomas, and Thomas Chetham, Bishop of Sidon. He does not appear to have taken the oath of the 'Veil Removed,' which was certainly prepared for him.² When Edward VI came to the throne, Kitchen succeeded, with slipperiness, yet more notable, in evading the requirement, forced on the bishops to sue out a royal licence³ under the terms of which their jurisdiction was exercised.

Consistent procrastination, omission, appeals to other courts, and absence from Parliament, aided Kitchen in thwarting most efforts

¹ L. & P. (Gairdner) for 1537, *passim*.

² The oath is drafted in Cranmer's Register. The oath to archbishop is omitted, space being provided for that and for the name of Lewis ap Thomas.

³ Complaint of Robert Davies, Star Chamber Proceedings, Ed. VI, Bundle 6, No. 34, Glam., incorrectly dated 1546 in calendaring.

to extend the Reformation into his diocese. In these skilful tactics, he was ably aided by his Chancellor, William Evans, who, in later years, to the great deprivation of historians, succeeded in abstracting the Diocesan Register.¹ Kitchen was, however, unable to prevent the plunder of the cathedral, which he turned to partial account, by showing that the see was too poor to pay for the priests needed to sing the new English service. A daily Mass continued to be said in the cathedral, throughout the reign of Edward VI.²

When the reign of Mary brought restoration of some of the loot that had been taken from church and diocese, Kitchen showed an absolute lack of desire to retaliate. He was appointed upon the commission to try and deprive the married bishops, Bush and others, and upon the commission designed to effect far more drastic punishment in the case of Hooper. Upon this latter he would not serve. Indeed, his aversion from the penalties awarded to heresy was so clearly marked that Rawlins White, who was burnt in Marian days, when brought before Kitchen to be tried, testifies to his gentleness and godliness.³

As recalcitrant in the reign of Mary, as he had always been, Kitchen failed to seek confirmation of his position from the Legate, Pole. When Mary died, he was in his eighty-second year, but attended the first Parliament of Elizabeth, voted against every measure involving religious change, and, in particular, opposed the grant of the Supremacy to the Crown. He was, it is alleged, deprived,⁴ and never formally reinstated, for a time abandoned episcopal attire,⁵ but continued to officiate daily in his sacerdotal capacity until his death in 1563.⁶

Parker affected to treat Kitchen's see as archiepiscopal,⁷ as indeed it was,⁸ and Kitchen behaved as if he were subject to no jurisdiction save his own. He even wrote, as must be reiterated, wherever it explains facts, to Elizabeth, informing her that whilst he would not, himself, take the Oath of Supremacy, he had no objection to any one else doing so. This complaisance was probably intended to aid the

¹ Chancery Proceedings, Bundle 55, No. 69, 1570-9. Wm. Evans replies to his adversaries that he obtained the register from the concubine of the complainant.

² Land Revenue Records, No. 678, Schedule 3.

³ Narrative concerning White in Foxe.

⁴ Machyn's Diary, June 21, 1559.

⁵ De Quadra to Philip II, July 12, 1559.

⁶ Bramhall, p. 37. The author conjectures that he used the English liturgy. That was nearly impossible. His sight had failed before its authorization. Further, a Latin liturgy was expressly authorized for cathedral use.

⁷ Lambeth Register. Hugh Jones is termed the Archbishop-Elect of Llandaff.

⁸ Daniel Defoe, *Tour through Great Britain*, 1727, p. 453.

Consecration of Parker,¹ and the treatment of Llandaff as an archbishopric would effect a legal advantage under the terms of the Act regulating the Consecration of the Primate of England.²

He died in extraordinary poverty. He had neither night-attire, under-garments, nor even bedding in the 'study' at Monks' Court, where he died.³ His will, which was proved, does not seem to exist now, and the fact of his death was carefully concealed from all, save such as Elizabeth, Cecil, Parker, whom it intimately concerned.

In the Vatican Archives, he is stated to have consecrated Parker,⁴ and this statement was considered in the treatment of Anglican Orders, and the failure of the succession was dated from Kitchen's last possible acts.⁵

The facts, relative to Kitchen, are thus summed up by the most competent authorities:

That hoary old rogue (Rev. William Pierce, now alas deceased, whose violence of language was always in exact reverse to his kindliness of heart).

The monstrous dilapidator of the see (Camden).

Papisticus addictissimus (Godwin).

A vain, greedy, ignorant old man (De Quadra).

An able man, well able to cope with the difficulties of the times (Dixon).

Bishop Kitchen of good memory (Archbishop Parker).

Of good life and keeps his house in repair (The Monastic Visitors).

A godly and kindly bishop (Rawlins White, sentenced by him for heresy, and burnt, adhering to his opinion of the Judge).

The account in the *Dictionary of National Biography* is better not read. Dixon's references to Kitchen are frequently utterly inaccurate, and he appears to have confused the bishop with a poet of a kind, who wrote verses on the death of Bucer.

Whilst alluding to such a confusion, the apparent error of Froude, dealing with the death of Cranmer, may be mentioned, cautionarily. He does not distinguish between a certain inhuman person named Ely, and Thirlby, the Bishop of Ely. Very possibly he knew better; indeed, the natural verdict after reading his *History* is that he did generally. No man ever exercised a greater economy of truth when fuller statement would have ruined an effective argument.

¹ John Lamb, *Hist. Act. of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, 1829.

² 25 H. VIII, cap. 20, sec. 4 iv. ³ R. O. Special Exchequer Commission, 5 Eliz. 7040.

⁴ Vat. Archiv. Arm. lxiv, Vol. 28, ff. 252-274.

⁵ Bull *Apostolicae Curiae* from 'Forma huiusmodi aucta quidem est . . . Hierarchia extincta potestas ordinandi iam nulla esset.' The statement that one century had elapsed between the death of Kitchen in October, 1563, and the adoption of the revised Ordinal in 1662 is a striking instance of the Bull's accuracy. Of the old hierarchy, Goldwell lived *abroad* for many years later. The reference is to Kitchen only.

SEC. 2

PARKER'S 'PRINCIPAL REGISTRAR' AND THE LAMBETH REGISTER

[The register that professes to record the consecration of Parker is one of a series, and is not dissimilar in form and bulk from others, its predecessors. It does not appear to claim exact contemporaneity with the events registered, and, indeed, in the account of Parker's consecration refers to Anthony Hussey as 'then' registrar, an admission which, quite apart from palaeographic considerations, would preclude the theory of Hussey's responsibility for the narrative.

There is no intent to recapitulate in this chapter the objections that have been alleged against the authenticity, and even against the veridical nature of the first part of this register. The purport of the following summary of acts is to show that the register could not have been written in Parker's lifetime, and not by any one acquainted with the essential facts, or, competent to furnish a complete and adequate account of the consecration. The argument does not, at this stage, affect to prove that the events recorded did not take place, but, that they are not evidenced by a document patently inaccurate—which is a different proposition. The developed thesis further purports to show that a consecration of Parker took place at an earlier date than that stated in the Lambeth Register, and that the consecrator was Anthony Kitchen. These contentions have, it is submitted, no bearing on the discussion concerning the validity of Anglican Orders, which the Bull of His Holiness, Leo XIII, indicated was decisively affected by the practice of the years 1563 to 1662.]

What light can be thrown on the events of the early morning of December 17, 1559, the time at which the Lambeth Register asserts that Archbishop Parker was consecrated, by consideration of the life history of Anthony Hussey, alleged witness of the consecration, and witness, indeed, so it is asserted, in the capacity of Parker's principal registrar? He is found, in the same register, present at some of the acts anterior to the events of December 17th, witness to their due performance as 'Principal Registrar'; but, he was absent from the Confirmation of Parker and from that of Grindal, two functions more closely affecting the office of Principal Registrar than did the Consecration.

What are the essential facts concerning Hussey? From the beginning of the Reformation in England, he had been of Gardiner's mode of thinking, always a reactionary, although never an extremist. Strype, in his account of the matter of the Heretics of Kent, represents Hussey as 'a secret favourer of the Papists,'¹ disloyal to Cranmer, whose registrar he was, and aiding the plot whereby Cranmer would have been brought to ruin. He continued his services under

¹ Strype's *Cranmer*, I. xxvii.

Pole, and, joined therein with Argall, attested the investiture with the Pallium, each signing in his due capacity of Notary Public, not in that of Registrar.¹ To Pole's policy, as to that of Cranmer's, he was attached with little ardour. He was obviously opposed to the pursuit of the trial of heretics to its legal conclusion. In the case of Archdeacon Philpot, whom Tunstall made every endeavour to save, Hussey found excuse to withdraw with that prelate,² when the inquiries of the Court were pushed beyond the limit they deemed compatible with the safety of the accused. It is not strange that such a man detached himself, little by little, from his old-time ecclesiastical functions, and acquired fresh offices of an entirely secular nature. The acts were those of deliberate disassociation with violent reactions and changes of religion, disturbing to the habit of mind of a Canonist and Chancery lawyer.

The fresh vocation to which he betook himself, in the latter days of Mary, was so dissimilar from any possible career that an aged lawyer might be expected to choose for himself, that a frame of mind, desirous of entire riddance of unwanted acts of daily life, necessarily postulates itself as a satisfactory reason for the selection. In and before these latter days of Mary, speculation concerning the existence of a north-eastern passage, by which the coasts of China and Japan would be opened to English merchants, had enthralled rather the love of adventure and romance than the avarice or desires of trade. To the corps of Merchant Adventurers, to whom the new hazards were committed, a worthy head was given, in Sebastian Cabot. Among those who fitted out ships in the port of London was Anthony Hussey,³ and his activities and address in his new capacity led to him being chosen, not only as one of the three Consuls of the new enterprise, but as 'Governor of the English Nation,' in Muscovy, Italy, Belgium, and Aquitaine. Over the latter districts he exercised his authority to the day of his death; the post of Governor of English merchants trading to Russia, he may have abandoned, when Sir Nicholas Bacon availed himself of Hussey's legal ability and learning, early in the days of Elizabeth.⁴

His functions with reference to the merchants could scarcely have been exercised without frequent absence from England. His will written in 1556, when he was still in the happy exercise of his new

¹ Pole's *Register*, Kitchyn, P.C.C.

² *Parker Society, Examinations of Philpot*, p. 112.

³ Patent Rolls, under date Feb. 26, 1555. I and II Ph. & M., pt. iii. mm. 31, 32.

⁴ He heard Chancery cases as Bacon's deputy from Nov. 6 to Dec. 2, 1559. Patent Rolls, 1559, m. 16.

powers, refers, with a tinge of regret, to the garden that he had been used to enjoy, and that he hoped his wife would tread, as he in days before her.¹ He did not contemplate other than occasional residence in London, after 1556 and 1557. He resigned his Registrarship of the Court of Arches in favour of his son,² the post of Registrar of the Court of Audiences and of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury was filled by Argall,³ and his connection with the ecclesiastical matters, that had so long been his, was almost entirely severed. Such was the state of his affairs in the early months of the reign of Elizabeth. Of all his former posts, he retained only that of Registrar to the Capitulary body of St. Paul's,⁴ of which many of the Canons were obstinately attached to the Old Religion, and of which one, at least, enjoyed protection so formidable that he remained excommunicate, obdurate, and contumacious, certain of removal from prison, so often as the new religionists put him there—Sebastian Westcott, the musician, Elizabeth's Master at the Chapel Royal. Redman and Whitbroke, the Sub-Dean of the Cathedral, were equally opposed to the new régime. Hussey was in every way suited to be their counsellor. That he was averse from the Elizabethan changes appears beyond doubt. On the other hand, he must have accepted the Royal Supremacy. He took out a Royal Pardon for offences, committed by him, that might have brought him within the mischief of the Statute of Provisors, or have incurred the penalties of Praemunire.⁵

His pardon for any offence that he may have committed, whilst Pole was Legate, had been preceded by promotion, rapid and likely to lead to the highest offices. Within a month or two of the accession of Elizabeth, Hussey had been made a Master in Chancery;⁶ in February, 1559, he was Recorder of London,⁷ and in the November of the year he was included among the Commissioners, of whom any three could hear and determine causes in Chancery, during the absence of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Keeper of the Great Seal.⁸ The patent was dated to endure until December 2nd only, unless otherwise renewed, and on December 2, 1559, Hussey may have relin-

¹ 52 Mellershe, P.C.C.

² Epitaph of Wm. Hussey in Stow's *London*. Stow expressly comments upon Anthony's resignation of his registrarship to the Court of Canterbury.

³ Patent Rolls, 1 Eliz., pt. i, m. 19.

⁴ 1 Eliz., pt. i, m. 21. The Court, an office held by patent, has not met recently; there was a legal proceeding there, however, a little over a century ago.

⁵ Patent Rolls, 1 Eliz., pt. i, m. 21.

⁶ Pardon Roll, Jan. 15. 1559. ⁷ Patent Rolls, Feb. 4, 1559. ⁸ Patent Rolls, Nov. 6, 1559.

quished the function, for, on that day, he was sitting as Master, and received the surrender of a grant of manors made aforetime to Sir Thomas Wrothe.¹ These juridical acts took place a week before the confirmation of Parker to his see, and about a fortnight before the event of December 17th, whereat the Lambeth Register states that Hussey was present in his capacity of Principal Registrar. Not only was he not 'Principal Registrar,' but he was occupying judicial positions, of which the compiler of the Register was plainly unaware. The function of a registrar is to register; that of a notary public is to attest; and, whilst it is quite conceivable that a Master in Chancery, or Recorder, present at a great public act, might witness the act in a due capacity, he would not—and that for the first time of error in a lengthy experience—describe himself as 'Registrar,' when his function was that of notary, and his official style quite other. Of that Hussey had shown himself aware in Pole's day.

Hussey's will, 52 Mellershe, had been made as early as January 12, 1556-7. To the confusion of antiquarians, he styled himself, 'Governor of the English Nation,' a phrase already explained. Among other bequests, he left to John Incent, who succeeded him, and William Hussey, in registrarships, twenty shillings 'in money,' and 'the joint patent of my office of Poules, willing him to bind up in due form the register of the late Archbishop Cranmer, together with all books belonging to the Archbishops and to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury.' It would appear that the loose leaves of the registers were not bound until years after the events recorded by them; a fact of great significance. To Argall, and to Sir John Tregonwell, he left tokens of remembrance; to Pole, nothing. The omission must receive due consideration. On August 18, 1558, he executed a strange codicil, giving to his wife a girdle, not to be worn until his death. A second codicil of November 12, 1559, provided for the performance of the will of Gabriel Donne, whose part in bringing Tyndal to his doom, may be recalled.

Thereafter followed the last illness of Hussey. On May 29, 1560, being in extremis, he declared that the wills of Donne and Legge had been duly administered. To Thomas Argall, he desired Sir William Chester, his executor, then present, to give a salt brought out of Flanders; to Campion, that is to Edmund Campion, afterwards martyr, but then Sir William's scholar at Oxford, he

¹ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 4 Edw. VI, pt. vi, March 10, 1550, and note thereon.

bequeathed a studentship of forty shillings a year. On the first of June, he died.

Since his epitaph and that of his son are of the greatest importance in estimating the evidential value of the Lambeth Register, they are annexed to this chapter. But, before the evidential value is weakened or strengthened by the perusal of these epitaphs, and of the comment of Stow, who is so strangely silent on most matters affecting Parker's consecration, let the significance of the binding of Cranmer's Register be pondered.

Loose papers have a way of being lost. If Parker's Register were also not transcribed from unbound documents until long after his death, there is nothing sinister in the first page of the Order of Consecration containing the memorandum of the death of the Archbishop, nothing sinister in the references to Hussey, as 'then' registrar. Some of the loose papers may have been mere memoranda, from which the original writer only could have gathered the whole tale. These pieced together, and transcribed with additions, as a connected narrative, might well yield a result continuously open to the discovery of errata.

Whilst it is no part of the argument of this chapter to suggest a defence of the Lambeth Register, its thesis does not, however, exclude the truth of many of the facts therein alleged, or the authenticity of many of the documents registered.

What is extraordinary is that the whole proceedings of an ancient court, that sits in chambers to consider and approve the documents relative to an episcopal confirmation, appear unknown to the scribe of Parker's Register. The sentence is pronounced by the Vicar-General at the conclusion of its proceedings; that for the only time. The Court emerged once into publicity, when Dr. Frederick Temple prevented a brawl at the confirmation of Bishop Gore, by reference to the completion of its functions in the citation of opposers. The ancient, translated, procedure follows, obviously, an older Latin model.

STOW'S RECORD OF ANTHONY AND WILLIAM HUSSEY

Epitaphs in St. Martin's, Ludgate:¹

Gulielmo Huseo, Caelibi, Almae Curiae Cantuariensis Registro, literarum scientia, vitae probitate, morumque urbanitate claro, notis et amicis omnibus dilecto, ANTHONIUS ET KATHERINA conjuges, Chari parentes, orbatu filio, Monu-

¹ Strype's *Stow*, I, Bk. 3, 176.

mentum hoc dolentes posuerunt. Obiit quinto Kalendas Novembris Anno Dom. 1559, vixit annos 28, menses 3, dies 7. Obdormiat in Domino.

Hic situs est Anthonius Huse Armiger, Londini natus, Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis atque Capitulis Divi Pauli Londinen. Registrarius primarius. Qui aliquot annos judicis causarum Maritimarum officio integre functus, ac etiam in Magistrorum Curiae Cancellariae consessum co-optatus, vergente demum aetate, ad Praefectum Collegiorum Mercatorum Angliae, tam apud Belgas quam apud Muscovitas et Rhutenos commercia exercentium accitus, lingua facundus, memoria tenax, ingenio, prudentia, doctrinaque pollens, morum comitate et probitate gratus, Laurentio, Gulielmo, Gilberto et Ursula liberis, ex Katherina conjugē procreatis, non infelix, sexagesimo tertio aetatis anno e vita excessit, Kalendis Junii, An. Dom. 1560.

Translation of the Epitaph of William Hussey

To William Hussey, bachelor, Registrar of the Court of Arches of the Province of Canterbury, gifted with knowledge of literature, with probity of life and with urbanity of conduct, beloved by acquaintances, and every friend, Anthony and Katharine, husband and wife, his loved parents, deprived of their son, in mourning have erected this monument. He died November 5, 1559; he lived twenty-eight years, three months, seven days.

May he sleep in the Lord.

November 5th, instead of October 27th, is given as translation, in deference to the passage of Stow, immediately hereafter quoted.

Translation of the Epitaph upon Anthony Hussey

[The translation is from Stow's transcript. Strype's *Stow*, vol. i, emphasizes the difficulty of accepting the statement that Hussey witnessed Parker's consecration on December 17, 1559, in these words: 'At length, in his advanced years, having apparently resigned his office of registrar to the Court of Canterbury to his son, William, who died in the November before, he became the governor of the company of the merchants of Muscovy.']

Here lies Anthony Hussey, of armorial family, who, born in London, occupied the position of principal Registrar, both to the Archbishop and to the Chapters of St. Paul's, London, and who, having, for several years, uprightly discharged the duty of Judge of Maritime Causes, and also of those co-opted in the Commission of the Masters in Chancery, he was, when verging on old age, called to the Prefecture of the Company of Merchants of England, engaged in organized commerce, in North France and Flanders, in Russia and Aquitaine; Ready of speech, unforgetful of memory,

in prudence and direction of policy, weighty; held in regard, both for his friendliness of manner and for his uprightness, and having begotten four children—Lawrence, William, Gilbert, and Ursula by Katharine, his wife—he died in the sixty-third year of a happy life, upon the 1st of June, 1560.

[Two comly monuments, each by other, in the East End of the Quire. A.M.]

CHAPTER II

THE DATE OF PARKER'S CONSECRATION; THE FALSE RECORD THEREOF IN THE LAMBETH REGISTER, AND THE TESTIMONY OF THOMAS ARGALL, AN ALLEGED WITNESS

'The Anciency of a thousand years in an untruth cannot get the Victory of one moment against the Truth: It continueth yet unovercome and incorrupt; nor are all the Princes of the World by their proclamations able to change the Truth into an untruth' (*William Cudworth, Minister of the Pentagon Chapel, Margaret Street, died 1763*).

SEC. I

THE ALLEGED WITNESSES TO THE ACTS OF DECEMBER 17, 1559

THE account, in the Lambeth Register, of the consecration of Parker, concludes: 'Acta gestaque haec erant omnia et Singula in praesentia Reuerendorum in Christo patrum Edmundi Grindal London episcopi electi, Richardi Cockes Elien electi, Edwini Sandes Wigorn electi Antonii Huse Armigeri principalis et primarii Registrarii dicti Archiepiscopi, Thomae Argall armigeri Registrarii Curiae Prerogativae Cantur Thomae Willett et Johannis Incent notariorum publicorum et aliorum non nullorum.'

The error in the description of Hussey has been, perhaps, sufficiently indicated. What of Incent and Argall? A great deal is known of these two, and their evidence is of particular value.

Argall succeeded Hussey as Principal Registrar of Parker; prior to December, 1559. He is named in the Patent Rolls of 1559, as Registrar of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, and of the Court of Audience. He was Principal Registrar until his death in 1563, when John Incent succeeded him. That John Incent was Principal Registrar in the following years is beyond doubt.

But the Lambeth Register amplifies the description of Incent, inaccurately. After having referred to Hussey as the Primary Registrar to Parker, the second of its folios proceeds: 'The aforesaid Anthony Huse, to whom John Incent succeeded, died 1 June, 1560.' The entry is not, as might have been expected, 'Huse to whom, I, John Incent, succeeded': the compiler of the register was a chronicler, not a forger, and that is to the credit of the document. But, Incent did not succeed Hussey, immediately.

Hussey was followed in the Registrarship of the Court of Arches by his son, William. Contemporaneously, Argall was Registrar of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury and of the Court of Audience; posts which, as his will proves, he retained to the day of his death. Therefore, the note must have been written after the death of Argall in 1563, and presumably after the death of Incent in 1588, since there is no reason to attribute, to the latter, ignorance of the office he held in 1560, or bad faith in the description thereof.

But, the evidence of Argall to the events of December 17th should be conclusive. He is cited as a witness, named as present in the most important of the documents relative to Parker's consecration. He was a notary public, and his statement, as to his presence on a day of consecration of an archbishop, furnishes legal evidence that even an unfair-minded critic cannot reject, or sweep aside, as though it were given in inadvertence or carelessness. His evidence, found in a legal document, should be conclusive. He was no youngster, like Francis Clarke,¹ the lad of nineteen, who is stated to have taken Hussey's place at the Act of Confirmation: Argall was a veteran whose vast legal experience dated back to the days of Warham.

In 1558, he is described by the Patent Rolls² as 'Thomas Argall, of London, alias Registrar of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, alias Keeper of the Records of the late Court of First Fruits and Tenths, alias a Remembrancer of the first fruits and tenths in the Exchequer, alias Writer of the Acts and Registrar of the Court of Audience of Canterbury.'

Here, then, is a witness, proper to record in his official capacity. His duties would lead him to be present at the consecration. He had witnessed the investiture of Pole, and, possibly that of Cranmer, and certainly knew well the nature of the rite of consecration. Further, there is the enormous weight of the fact, that, in his official capacity, and in the course of legal duties in the registration of legal documents, he thrice alleges the consecration of Parker, names a date, prior to which the consecration took place, affirms that from that date and the date of the confirmation, he, Argall, was commissioned afresh for his duties, and derived his legal powers from a confirmed and consecrated Archbishop, and, no longer from the

¹ Bartholomew and Francis were the sons of John Clarke, notary, whose will is 1 Peter, P.C.C., of 1572. He names both sons; Bartholomew being the elder. Bartholomew was twenty-one in 1559, and only thirty-seven, as he himself states, when he became Dean of the Arches in 1575. (See *Parker Society, Parker*, pp. 428-32.) Queen Elizabeth made special exception to the youth of Bartholomew, and urged his resignation.

² Patent Rolls, 1 Eliz., pt. i, m. 19.

Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, from which he had derived his legal jurisdiction during the vacancy of the archiepiscopal see. Furnished with the new jurisdiction, Walter Haddon, the Archbishop's Commissary, and Argall, proceeded to exercise their powers—on December 11th—six days before the December 17th on which Argall is alleged, by the Lambeth Register, to have witnessed the 'consecration.' His evidence against that 'consecration' would be fatal, were the issue to be brought before any court of law in the world. Explicitly, he states again, and again and again, that Parker was not merely elected and confirmed, but had been consecrated, by December 9th. So does Haddon, and so does Parker, who ought to have known.

As these facts would appear to be not easily compatible with the accuracy of the Lambeth Register, or, indeed, with a consecration on December 17th, it is desirable that the documents should be quoted in full. They are safe¹ in secular custody, and, for the benefit of searchers, their exact position is described.

The books that Argall kept, in his capacity of Registrar of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, hereafter known as the P.C.C., were: The Probate Act Book, the Administration Act Book, the Calendar of Wills, the Calendar of Administrations, and the Register of Wills. The Register of Wills for the year in which the confirmation of Parker fell is known as 'Mellershe.' This Register of Wills has been illustrated, as is much of Argall's work, with drawings of worth, and, in especial, with an excellent miniature of Parker, seated on his throne, and flanked by his officials and one nobleman. None of these present is vested as a prelate engaged in episcopal functions. The dress of Parker confirms the accuracy of the description given of his attire in the Lambeth Register. Whoever wrote that account had seen him, when vested. As a portrait of Argall, in his robes, is in the possession of his descendants, his identification, if he is in the group, should be easy.

A printed calendar to the register, 'Mellershe,' has been published by the British Record Society, and states that to the register, 'Mellershe,' there is no preamble. But to the ancient and disused calendar of 'Mellershe' there is a preamble. This calendar is behind a blue spring-blind, in the Literary Search Room of Somerset House, above the calendars of wills in use.

¹ Biographers of Laud will recall the disappearance of the registers of Stony Stratford and of Ibstock. The registers of All Saints, Lambeth, are difficult to trace.

The Preamble is as follows: 'Tabula et Repertorium auctoritate Reuerendissimi patris et domini Domini Matthei Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi A decimo die mensis Decembris anno Consecrationis suae primo et anno Domini 1559 usque in primum diem mensis Januarii Anno Consecrationis suae secundo Anno Domini 1560 probatorum et insinuatorum¹ et in libro vocato Mellershe Registratorum sequitur MELLERSHE.'

Here, beyond the shadow of a doubt, Argall states that the tenth day of December, 1559, was in the first year of the consecration of Archbishop Parker, and that the note is made designedly for the purpose of his duties, and for judicial cognizance.

If that same Thomas Argall is cited as a witness of Parker's consecration on December 17th, the citation is plainly based on an utter misapprehension of proved fact.

The Probate Act Book corresponding in date to the register 'Mellershe,' thus attests its authority: 'Testamenta approbata coram Magistro Waltero Haddon legum doctore Curiae Prerogative Reuerendissimi Domini Matthei Parker diuina prouidentia Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi electi et consecrati Custode sive Commissario a die ix Decembris, 1559.'

The first Probate Act is of date December 11, 1559, so that, not only was the authority cited, but was acted upon. That authority was, of course, the confirmation, which vested Parker with the legal jurisdiction in probate, on December 9th. But the material fact is that Haddon and Argall again attest that Parker was a bishop consecrated, prior to the time of that confirmation. From that confirmation, Parker absented himself. The word 'consecrati' has attracted the attention of some ecclesiologist of the seventeenth century, who has written against it a note, 'confirmati.' But, Argall and Haddon knew what they intended to write—and wrote it.

The third book, the Administration Act Book, furnishes congruent evidence: 'Liber Actorum Administrationum bonorum ab intestato decedentium auctoritate Reuerendissimi patris domini Mathei permissione diuina Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi totius Angliae primatis et metropolitani commissarum a nono viz die mensis decembris anno domini 1559 Magistro Waltero Haddon Legum Doctore eiusdem Curiae Praerogativae Cantuariensis custode sive Commissario et Thoma Argall Registrario.'

¹ i.e. 'set down on record for judicial cognizance' (*Ainsworth*)

Here again, on December 9, 1559, Parker is found with title of Archbishop and Primate, not with that of Archbishop-Elect.

Conjecture might have it that Argall was a man devoid of conscience, such as would witness one consecration before the ninth of December, and another of the same Archbishop upon the seventeenth of that month, and attest falsely, from levity, or perverse wickedness. Such a conjecture would offend against all evidence.¹ Argall's will,² a holograph of ten pages, is that of a pious and affectionate man, mindful of the poor and oppressed, and of the duties of life and death. The will is of July 15, 1563, and, like that of his master, Parker, avoids any reference to the Royal Supremacy. Argall bequeaths his soul to 'Almighty God, to our Blessed Lady Saint Mary, and to all the Holy Company of Heaven,' a dedication inconsistent with the supposition that Parker was an ardent Protestant, likely to resent the incorporation of the phrase in his register. Indeed, he selected Argall's son to succeed him in his duties. The relations between Parker and Argall were cordial enough. Argall leaves to the Archbishop a gilt cup and cover, of the value of ten pounds. He requests the Proctors, and the poor to whom he has left bequests, to pray for his soul. His legacies to prisoners and lunatics are unusually numerous, and include those within three Compters in London, and in the other in Southwark and the poor sick in Bethlehem, the prisoners in Newgate, Ludgate, King's Bench, the Marshalsea, the Westminster Compter and Gate House and the Fleet. For his 'poor children' left fatherless, he expresses an unexplained apprehension. They were grown-up and shared a large estate, which embraced not only the Manor of Walthamstow, but lands in Essex, Bucks., Dorset, Hants, and Bedfordshire.

So, with great care of sealing and witnessing, between three and four in the afternoon, on July 29th, and aided, it may be hoped, by his charity, and the barrels of herrings for the hungry, and amid apprehensions, for those who made their way promptly enough without his guidance, and in no great equanimity of mind generally, went Thomas Argall, neat penman and muddled religionist, from the City of Confusion, his manors, and the Registrarships of the Court of Audience and of the Prerogative Court, but seised of his

¹ As one of the oldest inhabitants of St. Faith's parish he had manifested piety and reverence in securing the restoration of the chapel of St. Faith's beneath St. Paul's to religious uses. In the days of Edward VI it had been used as a cellar for storage of wine. (Pat. Rolls, 3 and 4 Ph. and M., A. 2, mm. 41, 42.)

² 31 Chayre, P.C.C.

best hereditament, unbequeathed and unbequeathable, held in freehold for a life-estate (which as legal estimation goes might extend to all eternity) in Maryland, the first-named of the dwellings of that vexed soul, in his will, heretofore cited.

His Probate Act, penned doubtless by Lawrence Argall, whose writing is very similar to that of his father, Thomas, mentions the offices of the deceased, laying emphasis upon the fact that he was scribe of the court, as well as its registrar. Hussey's Probate Act does not even refer to his connection with the registrarship at any time, and as Argall inscribed that will himself, with particular care, shown obviously enough, the omission alone would have its significance.

SEC. 2

PARKER'S TESTIMONY TO THE DATE OF CONSECRATION

The statements of Parker relative to his consecration demand particular care, and carry no ordinary weight. He was a man in general of probity and honour; yet not above the concealment of essential facts, or the Machiavellian dealing common to Churchmen of his day. But, his general character forbids the belief that he would have consented to falsehood, concerning matters on which he would willingly have been reticent. He could evade the discussion of the source of Anglican Orders with the Bishop of Coutances by the provision of additional food and drink,¹ but that simple subterfuge was far remote from untruth. He preferred a written apology to a verbal controversy.²

Neither could he have been ignorant of the exact date of his own consecration. As an elementary postulate, perhaps necessary to state in these days of great freedom of religious opinion on matters of fact, he must have been present at his own consecration.

If, therefore, in his lifetime, and in official documents, he named a date of consecration, by express reference to the fact of his consecration, such testimony must outweigh the alleged evidence of any memoranda, purporting to have been written by him, and produced after his death.

What, then, are the facts? In brief these. In every official document in which Parker mentions the year of his consecration, that consecration shows date earlier than the date assigned in the Lambeth Register, when the date of the document falls between October 29th and December 17th. In other months, for obvious arithmetical

¹ *Parker Society, Parker*, p. 215.

² *Ibid.*, p. 199.

reasons that will appear, the year of consecration concurs with that of the Lambeth record.

Here are a few examples. He signs the commission to David Lewis and to William Evans to exercise jurisdiction in the Diocese of Llandaff, after Kitchen's death, 'sexto die Nouembris anno domini MDLXIII et consecrationis nostrae anno quinto.'¹ Kitchen had died in the October, 1563; the commission was issued forthwith, and a presentation to a living was made as early as the February following. Of the date, there cannot be any question; the commission issued, and was acted on shortly after its issue on November 6, 1563.

Neither does it need great mathematical ability to discover that, if the fifth year of Parker's consecration embraced the date, November 6, 1563, Parker was consecrated on or before November 6, 1559. The testimony of this fact is, therefore, in accord with that of Argall and Haddon.

The date of consecration is placed still further back by the next document; the attestation to a Latin appointment of a Special Form of Prayer to be observed throughout the Province of Canterbury. Parker concludes, 'In cuius rei testimonium sigillum nostrum praesentibus apponi fecimus. Datum in manerio nostro de Lambeth, vicesimo nono die mensis Octobris, A.D. 1572, et nostrae consecrationis anno decimo tertio.'²

Here, again, calculation will show that, if the thirteenth year of his consecration included October 29th, Parker was consecrated on or before October 29, 1559.

As a letter of Queen Elizabeth, under the Royal Signet, and dated October 26, 1559, states that the Archbishop-Elect of Canterbury remains unconsecrated, and urges 'all expedition,'³ the date of the consecration appears easy to determine, and should be the twenty-ninth of October, the Sunday following the Royal Letter, a date which coincides with that furnished by computation from the document of Parker last-quoted, and which supports the statements of Haddon and Argall.

The test of the accuracy of the theory that Parker was consecrated upon October 29th, is to be found in the application of the date to the computation of the year of consecration, as stated in documents other than those from which the original deduction was made.

¹ *Lambeth Reg., Cant. and York Society transcript.* In the original, not accessible to every reader, the date is in words, which are correctly interpreted by the numerals.

² *Reg. Parker*, II, f. 73a, *ut supra.* ³ *D.S.P.*, vii. 19, and *Parker Society, Parker*, p. 101.

Thus, in the record, entitled, '*Relaxatio Jurisdictionis Exercendae infra Diocesis Bristolensim sede Episcopali ibidem vacante*,'¹ the date is '*ultimo die mensis Octobris anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo sexagesimo et nostrae consecrationis anno primo*.' This would appear to confute the theory, and it is, indeed, an exception to the very large number of records that support the thesis, positively. But, the reader of the register will observe that Incent had prepared a number of documents for use,² at this period, in which the month and the year of consecration were expressed, but the day of the month left in blank, and that the '*ultimo*' is filled in such a blank. The year of the consecration was, therefore, rendered inaccurate by two days, probably in the course of the use of the labour-saving device.

On the other hand, and in support of the October date of consecration, consider, '*Citacio contra Decanum et Capitulum ad subeundum Inquisitionem*,' dated November 20, 1573, in the '*fourteenth year of consecration*.'³ This is compatible with the date, October 29th.

So also '*Dispensatio Willelmi Peerse ut possit recipere Beneficium non obstante defectu aetatis*' . . . *vicesimo septimo die mensis Novembris, A.D. MDLXX, et nostre consecrationis anno decimo secundo*.'⁴

In general, it may be said, that the official documents dated with the year of consecration are all compatible with the hypothesis put forward that Parker was consecrated on Sunday, October 29th, and that they are incompatible with the date assigned for the consecration in Part I of the Lambeth Register, wherein there appears what purports to be an account of that consecration on December 17, 1559.

If it be asked, does this involve the treatment of that Part I as a document wholly untrue, the answer to be given here would certainly not be in the affirmative. The compilation refers to some event that did take place on that day, of which the import may have been misunderstood, and of which lost details were recovered inadequately. The attempt to recover the details must have been after the time of Incent, who would not have been guilty of the blunders that have been noted.

Probably, the date of the rewriting and collection can be ascer-

¹ *Cant. and York Society Reg., Parker*, p. 675.

² A document immediately preceding his day and month left blank.

³ *Cant. and York Society*, p. 934.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 997.

tained by internal evidence. One help lies in an extraordinary slip made in 'The Return to the Queen's Writ of Certiorari, made by Parker.' This is dated, 'At Lambeth, 6, January, 1654,' instead of 1564.¹ If the scribe had been accustomed for some years to commence the year of the century with the words 'sexcentesimo,' instead of 'quingentesimo,' the error could be easily understood, but it could scarcely have occurred, accidentally, in the case of a writer in the fifteen hundreds. Furthermore, it must have proceeded from a writer used to express his years in words, that is from a writer of records. A guess, founded on this error, would assign the Part I to a registrar, collecting the documents of Part I, and amplifying the descriptions to the shape of his belief and information, in the early Stuart period.

This theory is corroborated by a consideration of the other document commonly used to support the date, December 17th, as that of Parker's consecration. This document, alleged to be Parker's memorandum, is printed in full, in an excellent translation, as well as in the original Latin, in the volume of the Parker Society to which reference has so often been made. The editor describes it as exhibiting two hands. Indeed, that description was necessitated by its record of many dated events, subsequent to Parker's death.

The roll thus compiled is preserved among the Parker manuscripts at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

The entries purport to be dated memoranda of events in the life of Parker, and of his children, extending beyond the limits of his life, and inscribed upon a roll of parchment. The difficulty concerning the two hands was candidly treated by the editor of the Parker Society volume, who pointed out that, even in the entries alleged to be made by Parker, there were passages of the nature of gloss, or annotation, to be assigned to the second script; and that, in the case of entries appearing to be in Parker's own handwriting, there were errors of years. These, it is submitted, destroy the claim of such entries to be considered contemporaneous.

However, the roll does contain an entry, which alleges that Parker was consecrated on December 17, 1559, and that is written in the form of a personal memorandum of the Archbishop. It is this roll and its evidential worth that will have to be considered, with relation to the date alleged.

¹ *Cant. and York Society Reg., Parker*, p. 449.

SEC. 3

THE PARKER FAMILY RECORDS AND MACHYN'S DIARY
THEIR VERIDICAL WORTH

The words 'second hand' in the following passages are used instead of 'the hand of an interpolator of later date.'

There are two records purporting to be contemporaneous, which corroborate the date assigned by the Lambeth Register for the consecration of Archbishop Parker. These two are Machyn's Diary and the roll of memoranda relative to the life of Archbishop Parker, preserved at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, to which reference has been made.

Machyn's Diary, to which examination will be directed later, does mention a ceremony of December 17th, but does not, unfortunately, indicate whether the ceremony was that of consecration, or of installation, or a new and reformed rite of a special nature, apt for the vague description given.

It is to the roll that the inquirer must, therefore, address himself for satisfaction. This roll, which records some events fourteen years subsequent to Parker's death, and, indeed, so dated, could not have been deposited by the Archbishop himself at the Library. In the absence of precise information as to the date of deposit, the document is scarcely 'evidential' from a juristic point of view, but certainly deserves careful examination from antagonists of the Lambeth account.

The roll, in which the date of Parker's consecration is alleged as December 17, 1559, is not, in general, chronological in its order. The mention of the consecration is inserted after details of family life, many of them of date much later than 1559. That mention of the consecration was, in fact, inserted in a space, conveniently vacant, and preceding certain miscellaneous entries relative to Parker's grand-children, written in the decades succeeding Parker's death.

Further than that part of the roll is in the handwriting of Parker himself, has never been suggested. In that portion of the contents, some additions have been interpolated by a scribe anxious to explain and amplify. There is not any suggestion made that the bulk of the entries was contemporaneous, as would be the case were the roll a diary. They are transcripts of memoranda, made upon the authority of Parker or, it is alleged, in some instances, by the Archbishop himself.

In attaining any general conclusion as to the evidential value of the document, it will, therefore, be of importance to note whether any details, purporting to be those of Parker's life, and also purporting made by himself, contain serious error, unlikely to have been made by him, and to draw conclusions concerning the veridical character of such portions generally.

The roll begins by giving an account of Parker's parentage, of his early education and tutors, detailed and careful, such as would have given to a forger incredible trouble, in research and vividness of imagination. Such portions of the roll must be considered as records founded on Parker's personal knowledge of his earlier career, and probably as extracts made from earlier memoranda, not now extant.

In the first entry the Rev. Thomas Perowne, the editor of the Parker Society volume, detects 'a second hand.' The portion assigned to interpolation is shown by italic type, beneath. '1522. 8 Septembr. circa annum aetatis meae 17, missus Cantabrigiam, *opera Mri. Bunge parochi Sancti Georgii, sed sumptibus matris*, in Colleg. Corporis Christi, sub tutore Ro. Cowper, Artium Mro. sed parum docto, edoctus in dialectica et philosophia, partim in hospitio Divae Mariae partim in Collegio (Corporis) Christi.' The interpolations are such as would flatter family pride, it will be noted, and, therefore, give some indication of their possible source.

The vital error in the statement is the date.

It was in 1521, not in 1522, that Parker went to Cambridge, as he himself elsewhere records.¹ Further, he was, as the roll itself amply testifies, in his nineteenth year on the day and date furnished by it, and not in his seventeenth. A weakness of elementary addition and subtraction, in fact, pervades the entries; and this weakness is not to be found in other of Parker's computations.

This first unsatisfactory entry is followed by two, irrelevant to the purpose of the investigation, and next by those that record his ordinations to the Major Orders:

1526 22 Deceb. Factus Subdiaconus, sub titulis Barnewelli, et Sacelli in campis Norwici.

1527 20 Aprill. Factus Diaconus.

1527 15 Junii. Factus Presbyter.

¹ Parker MSS., Corpus Christi College, Camb., cvi, art. 15.

These entries bear every probability of truth, and could not have been readily obtained, but from memoranda made by Parker.

From 1527, there is a lapse of six years without entry. Then occurs—

1533. Dominica Prima Adven- tus incepti officium praedicandi	(Grancetr	} 1 2 Dominica 3 Adventus 4 5
	Beche	
	Ecclia Benedci	
	Madingeley et	
	Barton	

Here the Rev. T. Perowne again detects the hand of the interpolator. He finds the names of the churches and the numbers and the words 'Dominica Adventus' to be in the 'second hand.' And little wonder! Parker could not at any time have made the blunder of believing that there were five Sundays in Advent. Any explanation involves a further error of the year. Such an explanation has been suggested—that Parker included Christmas Day in the Advent season. But Christmas Day did not fall on Sunday in the year named.

An entry of 1542, made out of order of date, contains a note of curious interest, relative to the presentation of Parker to the very small living of Ashen in Essex. This was a living in the Royal gift, and all marks of Royal favour, known to the writer of the second-hand, are noted to that effect. The living of Ashen was a portion of the short-lived Bishopric of Westminster, and was, in Parker's latter days, part of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex. The entry may be regarded as a true record of presentation in 1542; and the next entry of 1541 should be suspect. To the following entry, of 1544, 'Electus in magistrum Collegii Corporis Christi per *lras. commendatitias Hen. 8.*' there attaches a like dubiety. Only the portion in italic is suspect by Perowne, but the difference between 'Factus Subdiaconus,' etc., with its use of the appositive noun, and 'Electus in magistrum' will also be noted. The facts, asserted by the record, are correct in all detail, but are, probably, not reproductions of Parker's memorandum.

The entry of 1550: 'primo Octobr. Resignavi rectoriam de Burlingham, S. Andreae,' is regarded by Perowne as of the second-hand, so far as regards the last two words. 'primo Octobr.' is not Parker's habitual style, and the rectory is that of St. Andrew and St. Edmund, conjoint.

A copious series of memoranda of the years 1552, 1553, and 1554 presents trace of only one interpolation. Then comes:

'1554. 21 Maii Spoliatus fui decanatu meo de Lincolne; sic, eodem die prebenda mea de Coringham in eadem ecclia. Ad quam presentatus fuit Mr. Georgius Perpoynt, vi advocacionis eius mihi concessae per Epum. Lincoln, J. Tailor. Decanatus conferebatur Fran^o Malet, D. Theo per M. Reginam.'

The entry bears no mark of contemporaneous compilation. On May 21, 1554, Tailor was 'late Bishop of Lincoln.' Perowne questions 'mihi,' and might also have noted vi, 'sic,' and 'Lincolne.' Parker, who was quite unmolested throughout the reign of Mary, and in his residence at Cambridge, during Thirlby's episcopate at Ely, would not have made a needlessly incautious and violent entry of the form, 'spoliatus,' such as would furnish evidence of disaffection against him, already involved in the Lady Jane Grey matter as he was.

The 1554 entry continues with a lengthy passage, replete with pious expressions, different entirely from Parker's usual concise style.

'Postea privatus vixi, ita coram Deo laetus in conscientia mea, adeoque nec pudefactus nec dejectus, ut dulcissimum ocium literarium, ad quod Dei bona providentia me revocavit, multo unquam majores et solidiores voluptates mihi pepererit, quam negotiosum illud et periculosum vivendi genus umquam placuit.'

This extract, which continues to much greater length, is dated October 26, 1554. It indicates that Parker was happier in Marian days than during the years of the Reformation, which he characterizes as the days of his perilous concern in the business of this world.

This entry, which is consonant with all that is known of Parker's disposition,¹ is succeeded by three that could not, apparently, have been entered at the time they profess to be written. As they are pious expressions of the state of the soul, and of resignation to the will of God, on the dates named—Aug. 6, 1557; Feb. 3, 1552; and Dec. 14, 1556—it would seem that an author who commended his soul's aspirations to the Almighty, and dated the aspirations, would be careful to record at least the exact year. Mr. Perowne finds it necessary to assign the passages to 1555, 1555, and 1556. Since, however, the entry of August 6 contains a significant piece of internal evidence, the passage under that date is transcribed in full. 'Et adhuc, 6 Augusti Anno Domini 1557 [1555, Perowne] persto eadem constantia, suffultus gratia et benignitate Domini mei, et Servatoris Jesu Christi, quo inspirante absolvi Psalterium versum

¹ The truth is, what with passing those hard years of Mary's reign in obscurity, without all conference or such manner of study as might now do me service I am so babyished in myself that I cannot utter in talk with other.' (Letter to Cecil, Lansdowne MS., art. 89. circ. 1563.)

metrice lingua vulgari; et scripsi defensionem conjugii Sacerdotium contra Thom. Martin.'

If this passage was, in fact, not compiled at the date furnished by the manuscript, but was, in fact, the afterthought of another day, put into a roll compiled during Parker's episcopate, it would appear to be a most unpleasant piece of hypocrisy. Fortunately, there is no reason to suppose that the error of date arose from any other cause than the copying of the memoranda of Parker by a scribe who was primarily careless, and in nothing particularly scrupulous.

The reference to the work of Thomas Martin seems to furnish a base for Perowne's dating. Thomas Martin engaged in controversy with Poyntet in 1554, concerning the marriage of priests, and later editions of Poyntet's book had additions of which the acknowledged author was Parker. The version of the Psalms is more difficult to date. It has no printer's name, but is stated to be produced, under the privilege of the Queen's Majesty, with ten years' privilege. The author's name is not furnished, and it is possible that the compilation was printed during the Marian period. The verse is of higher level than would be expected in metrical Psalmody, and Collects that have escaped notice are annexed to the three Quinquagenes.

The carelessly transcribed records of Parker's spiritual emotions at various dates are followed by a list of his sermons, preached before Royal auditors between 1534 and 1559. The entry for 1551 reads: 'Coram illustr. Rege Edwardo in quadagesima, scz. alternis diebus Mercurii, viz. 9, 23, 25 diebus Martii, collega meo Magistro Harlow, Episcopo Herfordiae.'

If any additional evidence were needed that this roll could not be a transcript, made by Parker himself, of the events of his life, such an entry would be conclusive. The 25th of March, 1551, was a Wednesday, but alternate Wednesdays in that month could not fall on the 9th and 23rd. Neither would Parker be likely to confuse Hereford and Hertfordshire, or to imagine a bishop of the latter non-existent see. The final evidence of interpolation is that Harley was not Bishop of Hereford, or any other see until three years later, in May, 1554.

Following the list of sermons is a series of entries such as would be expected in a family Bible—the births, deaths, and marriages of his near kindred. The first is a very circumstantial entry of his marriage with Margaret Harlston in 1547. The second entry could not have been made with the first before the eye of the writer, and in his attention. It records the death of the same Margaret in 1570, after

she had lived with Parker twenty-six years, 'more or less.' What possible difficulty could Parker have had in discovering that she had lived with him twenty-three years, had the first entry been extant and before his eyes? The inference that the roll embodies inaccurate extracts from memoranda becomes overwhelming.

Some portions of the spiritual anthology of quotations are certainly derived from Parker. Thus, 'Dominie vim patior, responde pro me' is an extract from the last letter of Parker,¹ and can be translated with an accurate reference to the sufferings of the patient, 'O God! I am in much physical pain, declare Thy Presence unto me.' A very proper aspiration for one who had been ruptured by a fall from his horse (when galloping indiscreetly, after dinner), and who suffered from the stone so common to the victims of Elizabethan diet. Scarcely, however, so appropriate to a consecration, as archbishop: for which the preposterous roll uses the quotation.

Yet what could a forger, or the supplementer of evidence, effect? His handwriting was a part of a forger's technical training, but the composition of Latin prayers for a particular occasion was not. He did his best. He kept to quotations, and if the quotations were not the most appropriate, nevertheless the Latinity was beyond reproach. The 'etc., etc.,' is accountable, likewise. The poor scribe found Parker's note of some text in that state. Indeed, such abbreviations occur with frequency in his letters. Concordances were not available to the Elizabethan forger (or compiler of evidence). He had, therefore, perforce, to retain the 'etc.' as he had found it in his sources, bound to such course by his inability to complete the text. But, thereby, he rendered the prayers attributed to Parker at his consecration ridiculous. No man has ever abbreviated a solemn prayer to God for guidance, by adding 'etc.,' 'etc.,' to the petitions and laments.

The effort of the interpolator, in the compilation of prayer, is added, in order that its obvious fraudulent nature may be apparent.

[1559] 17 Decemb. A° 1559 consecratus sum in Archiepiscopus Cantuar:

"Heu, Heu, Domine Deus, in quae tempora servasti me. Jam veni in profundum aquarum et tempestas demersit me. O Domine, vim patior, responde pro me: et spiritu tuo principali confirma me: homo enim sum, et exigui temporis, et minor, etc. Da mihi fidium tuarum, etc."

¹ April 11, 1575.

CHAPTER III

THE NATURE OF THE RITE USED AT PARKER'S CONSECRATION AND PROVED FALSITIES OF THE LAMBETH REGISTER

[Declaramus] 'eos tantum episcopos et Archiepiscopos, qui non in forma Ecclesiae ordinati et consecrati fuerunt rite et recte ordinatos dici non posse' (*Declaratory Brief of H.H. Pope Paul IV, Archiv. Secret. Vatican. Brev. Original. Pauli PP. IV, Tom. I, no. 301*).

SEC. I

ON Parker himself the externals of religion rested lightly. He was, if his letters indicate aright, a good trencherman, with a moderate liking for liquor before the days of his decay. Perhaps his inclination towards the pleasures of the table grew, after the deaths of his wife and of Thirlby, at a period of life when former excellent dispositions towards God and holiness struggled painfully with peevishness and increasing moody temper. Always, he was of infinitely curious disposition—hence the phrase 'nosy Parker,' now passed to a term of opprobrium. Of Argall's religion, of the purpose of Thirlby's 'querester,' of the alienation of Hussey's feeling, of the doubts concerning Barlow, of the reason for the inquiries of the Bishop of Coutances with reference to Anglican Orders¹ he knew all requisite. He had religious principle sufficiently strong to survive some enforced association with Scory and intimacy with Barlow, and to outlast the contact (merely smutted) to a Christian end. He treated his Sacraments with reverence, had been willing to continue as a parish priest in Marian days, believed in a Real Presence of a sort,² used wafer-bread always, and was, in short, rather a High Churchman. Moreover, he was by zeal a real antiquarian, who would not personally have falsified a record, or connived in the falsification. He interested himself, particularly, in 'the Ancient British Church,' in which he found an independence from Rome that justified his lonely position in Catholic Christendom. For he believed himself not separated from the Catholic Church. His will, which Strype has the discretion not to print, is quite clear upon that

¹ Letter to Cecil, June 3, 1564.

² See his correspondence with Guest on 'only after a heavenly and spiritual manner.'

point. He died believing the Catholic Faith, as found in the Fathers; so he professes. Not that he meant thereby any recantation. He wrote to Cecil after his will had been drafted, 'If I, you, or any other, named "great Papists" should so favour the Pope or his religion, that we should pinch Christ's true Gospel, "woe be unto us."' ¹

Upon matters of Consecration and Episcopal Jurisdiction, Archbishop Parker had always care above the average of his brethren. Thus, on October 5, 1567, he writes to Cecil, discriminating between the jurisdiction given to bishops by the Royal Assent (in this case to the appointment of Hugh Curwen to be Bishop of Oxford) and the archiepiscopal confirmation of Curwen in the jurisdiction spiritual. He notes that he had insisted upon such confirmation in the cases of the Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of Chichester, Hereford, and St. David's, all of whom had been occupants of other sees prior to their confirmation in those that he named. He had insisted upon oath and profession to the See of Canterbury. This tenacity is not to be reconciled with any view that he regarded his position as that only of a state function, deriving its jurisdiction from the sovereign.

Again, in the very last letter that he wrote to Cecil, immediately prior to his death, Parker boasts the concurrence of Elizabeth in his own views. 'Her Majesty told me that I had the Supreme Government Ecclesiastical.'

Probably, in ecclesiastical polity he was influenced by the guest, Thirlby, Bishop of Ely, with whom he failed to agree on much, but whose character he always extols. In the most poignant of his griefs, at the time of the death of his wife, the beloved mother of children whom, even during his episcopate, he had not feared to legitimate, Parker could put aside his personal sorrow, to express his apprehensions for his friend. Mrs. Parker died nine days before Thirlby. On the eve of her death, Parker engaged in writing to Sir William Cecil to seek Thirlby's removal to his friends. ² The Archbishop in a passage of grief on edge, writes, 'I thought by his presence (being both of us much of an age) to learn to forsake the world and die to God; and hereto I trust to incline myself, what length or shortness of life may follow.' When a Reformation bishop could openly

¹ Letter of April 11, 1575.

² That is, no doubt to his near relative, Margaret Blackwell, née Campion; kin of the martyr, the Blessed Edmund Campion, for whom Parker had much esteem, and of Thirlby's sister, Agnes Payne. The Blackwells had bought the manor of Campions, and lived in Blackfriars, in a house (near Ireland Yard), wherein a room was long known as Thirlby's Chamber.

avouch as his exemplar a Roman Catholic bishop, one may infer that the principal, deliberated, acts of the exemplar were not regarded as unfit for studious attention and selective imitation.

Now Thirlby had been concerned, more closely than any other bishop, more closely than Pole himself, in the determination of the unfitness of the Edwardine form of consecration to impart the priesthood and the episcopate. How did Parker regard that Edwardine form? How, the rite of 1552?

In February, 1550, a new Ordinal had appeared, which was to supersede the ancient Pontifical. The ecclesiastical validity of this form of Consecration and of Ordination was contested, at the time, by the usual 'Catholic-minded' bishops; but, under one or other of the new parliamentary rites, Poyntet, Hooper, Scory, Tailor, and Harley, certainly, and Coverdale, Ferrars, and Grindal probably, were, at one time or another, created bishops. Of none of these, save Scory, has it ever been alleged that the consecration was regarded as valid by Roman Catholics; and Scory's position is perplexing. That of Coverdale has also its special points of interest. Grindal is alleged to have been consecrated by Harley, amongst others.¹ He was almost certainly consecrated by Parker but a passage in Machyn's Diary² lends possibility to the suggestion that Harley survived to Elizabethan days, and that the allegation of Mason may have had a basis of fact. If doubly consecrated, his position would not be unique. It is even said that Parker consecrated Scory afresh in 1560.³ Scory certainly was consecrated in August, 1551, and perhaps again in Marian days. The first of these consecrations was at the same time as Coverdale,⁴ whom Parker never recognized, or treated as a bishop at all, although Coverdale is said to have been coadjutor to Voysey, the old Catholic Bishop of Exeter, and also, thereafter, the Protestant occupant of that see. To Hooper, Parker refers always *tout court*, without title, even when title is given to another bishop in the next few words. To Harley he refers, or his copyist refers, as Mr. 'Harlow,' from which very little can be deduced.

Parker must necessarily have had an opinion on this subject of the Ordinal, for it concerned him, as Archbishop, very closely. All that can be alleged, securely, is that his general tendencies to safe proceeding, and to exact, very exact, compliance with law, would have led him to prefer a form of which the validity and legality

¹ Mason, *de Minist.* 353. ² See September 6th. ³ *Parker Society*, 1 Zurich, 63.

⁴ Cranmer's letter to Cecil promising the consecration is dated August 23, 1552. The consecration is assigned to August 30, 1551.

could not have been denied by his opponents. Neither he, Cecil, nor Elizabeth knew whether a reconciliation with the Papacy might not take place, and he, Cecil, and Elizabeth were all conjoined in a determination that the archiepiscopate should remain in Parker. Sandys, always Parker's enemy, and sometimes his traducer, perceived this tendency of Parker's, and reproached him, with flippant coarseness, for his lukewarmness towards the revised liturgy, during the passage of the legislation that gave the Prayer Book its effect, in April, 1559.¹

The question must therefore be restated in the form: Would Parker willingly have made use of a rite, of 1549, to which he was not pre-disposed, in 1559; a form repealed and illegal, and when the form contained in the Pontifical was alone legal. There is not, of course, the slightest indication, in one word that Parker ever wrote, or one act that he ever performed, to suggest that he would, needlessly and deliberately, break the law, as it stood, for the gratification of principles he positively condemned. His references to Hooper's case, for example, all point to his desire that the powers of the Council should be used, in Elizabethan days, as in the time of Hooper, to enforce compliance with ecclesiastical regulations upon the advanced and troublesome Reformers.²

Now what form of consecration was legal and valid at the date of Parker's consecration to the Archiepiscopate? The answer depends, as regards the legality, upon Acts of Parliament. The Ordinal of 1549/50 had been removed from legal use in the Marian period, and the older Pontifical restored to its place as the only permissible form. At the accession of Elizabeth and for some few years thereafter, the forms of 1549 were not restored to the Statute Book, and, when so restored, were not rendered the exclusive form of ordination and consecration. The old Pontifical was not forbidden. Just as some services of the ancient ritual are preserved as at the coronation and anointing of monarchs, so also, apparently, the Pontifical could still be used legally at the consecration of an Archbishop of Canterbury.³

Concerning the illegality of the Reformed Ordinals in 1559, and their unsuitability for the purpose of the consecration of the first Elizabethan archbishop, there can, fortunately, be no controversy.

¹ *Parker Society, Correspondence of Abp. Parker*, April 30, 1559. ² *Ibid.*, March 8, 1565.

³ Rogers, Chaplain to Bancroft, asserts that, even in the reign of James I, the form of consecration was that used in the days of Henry VIII. (*Parker Society, Rogers*, p. 332. He probably errs.)

Cecil pronounced on the matter contemporaneously.¹ He stated, accurately, that those forms could not be used, because they had not the authority of Parliament, and he certainly took no steps at the appropriate time to obtain the sanction. Neither did Parker.

The second requisite for the form to be used, namely validity, depends upon ecclesiastical pronouncements. These pronouncements will differ, according to the religion—Protestant or Roman Catholic—of the authority prayed in aid. Fortunately, this difference is irrelevant in the case in point. Both Parker and Cecil are at one in arguing that Parker's consecration was valid, from the Roman Catholic point of view; that it would be found valid by the bishops sitting at the Council of Trent.

Such was the purport of the communication made by Cecil to De Quadra, the Spanish Ambassador. The latter, although perplexed, credited Cecil. He was sure that, on this occasion, Cecil was neither knave nor fool. Indeed, he was sure that he was not a fool at any time. 'He spoke as an honest man,' thought De Quadra, and as one who understood the purport of his words. The Ambassador wrote to his King, Philip, upon March 25, 1561,² recounting Cecil's assurance that the English bishops had been consecrated and ordained, not like Lutheran or Calvinist heretics, merely elected, and that Cecil had asked whether they would be admitted, with the rest, to sit at a General Council. Cecil was claiming a consecration, of Parker and of others, that Rome could recognize, effected by a ritual that Rome could deem valid.

Cecil could only have intended the Sarum Pontifical by such a ritual. He had been of the Council in the reign of Mary, and could not have failed to know that the Ordinal of 1549 was considered by the Holy See absolutely futile, and incapable of conferring Orders. To that effect, the Bull *Praeclara Charissimi* of Paul IV, a pronouncement rendered incapable of misunderstanding by a subsequent Brief, had witnessed. Under the terms of that Brief, the 'pretended' bishoprics of Edwardine bishops had been declared null and void, and their ordinands had been ordained afresh. Kitchen, selected by Mary to pronounce their episcopate false, was selected by Cecil to confer upon Parker an episcopate that should be true.

The Bull of July 12, 1555, was duly entered in Pole's Register, and, possibly, in that of every other diocese in England. At some time later, probably after the enactment of the Ordinal in

¹ D.S.P., 1558.

² State Papers, Spanish.

8 Elizabeth, the Bull and Brief were removed so completely from record that their very existence was forgotten, much to the detriment of the arguments advanced in the seventeenth century concerning the vexed question of Anglican Orders. The removal was an act of policy, but could not affect the position taken up by Cecil. He could not be so ignorant or so foolish as to believe that De Quadra would be forgetful of the Bull, or willing to waive its declarations. He invited Parker to discuss the alterations in religion with De Quadra. Parker preferred that the matters should be put into writing, and the writings returned to the parties producing them.¹

To another Roman Catholic bishop, who visited England in the train of the French Ambassador, Parker had an opportunity of placing the Anglican position.

Arthur de Cossé, Bishop of Coutances, whom Parker describes to Cecil, in a letter of June 3, 1564, as a good 'soft-natured gentleman,' was the bastard brother of the marshal of his race, and the successor to that Bishop of Coutances who had, so creditably, troubled himself with the preservation of Catholicism in the Channel Islands. With him, Parker discussed the alterations in religion and 'orders ecclesiastical'—which de Cossé had 'imagined' the Church of England had not. It would be difficult to imagine that Parker would explain that he had been consecrated by an Ordinal that was to be legalized the year following the conversation.

Parker did not show the Bishop any copy of the Ordinal used, but confined his explanations of change to those contained in the Book of Common Prayer and of the Administration of the Sacraments. Of this latter a very disingenuous version had been produced for foreign consumption, and for home use by those who could be found in the cathedrals to prefer the Latin to the English version. The Latin 'translation' of the Book of Common Prayer made provision for the Reservation of the Sacrament, for a funeral Mass, with a Collect containing a prayer for the deceased, and for Private Masses, legalized by an extraordinary device. Sick parishioners who wished, perilously, to communicate at such a 'Private Mass' were enjoined to furnish names as communicants to the priest celebrating, *postridie*, 'the day after.' By this provision, the law forbidding Private Masses was neatly and effectually nullified, without a single Puritan protest. For Puritan hoodwinking, Barker and Vautrollier were authorized to produce a genuine Latin translation

¹ *Parker Society, Parker, Letter to Cecil, p. 201.*

of the Book of Common Prayer, of which no copy is known to have made its way abroad at this period.

The absence of the Ordinal from the Latin Book is noteworthy. The Book was for cathedral use. Had Parker designed to have used the Puritan Ordinal, at a time prior to its legality, he would surely have altered and incorporated it in a book intended as a manual of the functions of the higher clergy.

The investigation of the problem of the nature of the liturgical rite used at the consecration of Archbishop Parker will evidently entail abandonment of any complete reliance on the Lambeth Register, and on its strange record of the acts of Edwardine bishops, and of a suffragan debarred from so consecrating, assembled at six o'clock on a winter morning, to wear unaccustomed vestments that they detested, and join in the use of an illegal rite, gagged with unexpected additions, and that for the making of an archbishop whose whole tenour of accurate conduct throughout his life would evidence his entire disapproval of every detail of the recorded proceedings.

The writer of the Lambeth account shows always the spirit of a day other and later than those of the early episcopate of Parker. It is a more Protestant day to which he bears witness. Hence the insistence on the use of the Edwardine Ordinal.

A glimpse of the spirit that led to this insistence is to be found from the consideration of another entry in the Lambeth Register. Hugh Curwen, Archbishop of Dublin, was, in 1567, translated to Oxford. He had been consecrated in the reign of Mary, at St. Paul's Cathedral, on September 8, 1555, by Bonner. Yet, in an alleged Mandate to Edmund Gest, dated October 15, 1567, and to be found in the Lambeth Register, Parker, who is supposed to be enjoining the installation of Curwen, saying that he, Parker, had consecrated him, '*adhibitis de ritu et more ecclesiae Anglicanae suffragiis et insigniis adhibendis*.'¹

Of course this supposed consecration never took place. We have fortunately Parker's own account of what actually happened, preserved in the Domestic State Papers. In a letter of October 5, 1567, he relates to Cecil the illness and helplessness of Curwen, who had been elected to the see only upon the 26th September preceding. He thinks that Curwen, the Bishop of Oxford, should have a coadjutor,

¹ The document does not appear to be printed in full in the Canterbury and York Society edition of Parker's Register, and Curwen's name is not indexed. But a summary of the Mandate contains the phrase quoted.

and he rejects three names suggested by Cecil. To the next three names he objects that the proposed coadjutor, if selected from them, would be destitute of private means. He then refers to the election of the Bishop of Oxford, and establishes the archiepiscopal claim to the receipt of the Oath of Spiritual Allegiance by himself, in the following terms: 'Where your honour writeth that his election is orderly passed with the Queen's Majesty's assent, so I think it will not be forgotten that he [i.e. Curwen] must come hither by himself, or his procurator, before he be stablished; for both order and law and the King's Letters Patent in the erection of that church and bishoprick exempteth him not, either from oath or profession to the See of Canterbury; for this election, or rather postulation, is but to be presented to the Queen's Highness to have her royal assent, and after that to be sent hither for his confirmation in the jurisdiction spiritual. The Archbishop of York so passed, and the Bishop of Chichester,¹ Hereford, and St. David's went that way. The Archbishop of York was Young; Chichester was Barlow; Hereford, Scory; and St. David's, Richard Davis—all formerly reformed bishops of other sees.

This passage from Parker's letter leaves no doubt that he did not consecrate Curwen. He suggests that he would receive Curwen's procurator. A consecration by deputy of a procurator would be a novelty, even to the days of the Reformation. Neither is there any parallel in any act of Parker or of his successors to the second consecration of a Marian bishop.

What reason can be assigned for the falsifying of the record of a mandate like to this for Curwen, recorded in Parker's Register and recounting the consecration that never took place? The only assignable reason would be that the circumstances of Curwen's consecration were forgotten, and that, in a Protestant day, it was desirable to show that all traces of Curwen's former papistry had been utterly abandoned, and that he was consecrated according to the reformed ritual. If such an explanation be correct, it will be difficult to receive as historical record, not merely the consecration of Curwen in 1567, but the account of the consecration of Parker on December 17, 1559, according to the reformed rite. If one account is utterly and demonstrably false, why accept the other on like authority?

¹ William Barlow. If the passage were construed to imply that Parker had, in fact, consecrated Curwen, it would also imply that he had consecrated Barlow.

Such a rite as that of the Edwardine period could not have been used by Parker, and could not even have been contemplated by him as possible in his case. For, as Hook rightly remarks, in his *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, to Parker had been permitted, as to others in like case, to name those whom he and they desired to act as consecrators, and he had named, first Tunstall, then Poole of Peterborough, Bourne of Bath and Wells, and Kitchen of Llandaff; men who had all concurred in denouncing the reformed Ordinal, as insufficient and invalid. What reason could they have had to contemplate the use of a form they detested, at a time when its use was positively illegal? What conceivable hope could Parker have had of persuading them to such use?

That Parker was consecrated by one of these bishops, according to the ancient rite, at a time prior to December, 1559, appears, not only from the documents heretofore considered, and from the statements of the contemporary registrars of Parker's acts, but from the very significant form of the *Summaria Petitio*, a document to be found on folio 5 in verso of the Lambeth Register. This document has every appearance of authenticity. It relates Parker's family affairs, and his worthiness, and sums the requests, prior to his confirmation in December, 1559. The principal request should be for consecration. Oddly enough, this, which might be supposed to be included in the purpose of the *Summaria Petitio*, is omitted. A sufficient reason, of course, was that Parker had already been consecrated. The name of the consecrator is logically omitted, therefore, from the list of bishops, from whom the remaining functions, such as that of installation, is requested. The bishop, Kitchen, had fulfilled the Royal Mandate that Parker cites, and further fulfilment could not be required of him. The document demanding confirmation, therefore, addresses itself to Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, Hodgkins, Salisbury, and Bale, and signifies the royal order, 'Quatenus vos electionem predictam et eiusdem electum confirmare ipsumque episcopalibus insigniis insignare et decorare ceteraque peragere qua vestre in hac parte incumbunt Officiis Pastoralibus juxta forma Statuti in ea parte editi et provisi et litterarum patentium huiusmodi velitis cum favore.'

This reasonable request to instal Parker with all accustomed and proper rites was doubtless fulfilled. In fact there is a curious record of an installation in Aldrich's *Historiola*, printed about 1574. The learned Puritan mentions 'four bishops, being appointed according

to a law made in that behalf, placed him in his chair, with so godly promises protested by him as it meet should be of a gospel-like pastor.' Although Aldrich appears in error if his words be construed to mean that a special new statute was necessary to ensure Parker's installation as a Protestant archbishop, he is possibly correct in asserting that four bishops concurred in some such ceremony, and that it was devoid of papistical rites. This installation may have given rise to the tradition of a consecration on December 17, 1559. The curious who wish to investigate this interesting sideline of historical error will recall that an excellent miniature of an installation, or of an official sealing in ceremonial sort, is to be found in the register, 'Mellershe,' to which former reference has been made.

SEC. 2

PARKER'S CONSECRATOR, AND CONSECRATION

Having established the date of Parker's consecration, as on or about October 29, 1559, and having furnished much evidence that the rite used was an adaptation of the Sarum Pontifical, the name of the consecrator has to be determined.

The Holy See, which has frequently warned temerarious controversialists that, at the Vatican, there is copious material, relative to Anglican Orders, yet unpublished,¹ has expressly separated the consecration of Parker from the Papal pronouncements upon the consecration of later bishops and has never asserted the invalidity of that consecration. It has not been the matter of decision, since no practical question, arising from its individual circumstances, has ever arisen. It is true that, in the matter of the reception of Bishop Gordon, the Scottish Protestant Bishop of Galloway, who became convert to Roman Catholicism, his Petition to the Holy Office recited much, of doubtful account, relative to Parker's consecration. He credited the Nag's Head tradition. But, even in his case, the decision of the Holy Office was based on rejection of the rite employed in the consecration of Anglican bishops, predecessors of Gordon in line of succession, and was not based on a consideration of the historical question to which this chapter seeks to offer the solution.

The Bull, *Apostolicae Curae*, of His Holiness, Leo XIII, may be cited as a perfectly definite statement upon the separation of the case

¹ 'Ut ipsi diplomata opportuna omni possent copia in tabulariis vaticanis sive nota recognoscere sive inexplorata educere' (*Apostolicae Curae*).

of Parker from that of subsequent Anglican bishops. Quoting from the translation by Mgr. Barnes¹ of the words of the Pontiff: 'And here it is important to observe that although Gordon himself, whose case it was, and some of the Counsellors, had adduced among the reasons that went to prove the invalidity [of Gordon's Orders] the Ordination of Parker, *according to their own ideas about it*, yet, in the delivery of the decision [in Gordon's case] this reason was altogether set aside, as documents of incontestable authenticity prove.'

The Holy See does not use, concerning the allegation of Counsellors of the Holy Office, such a phrase as, 'altogether set aside,' without the gravest cause. Whilst accenting the adequacy of the translation furnished, consider the import of the original text: 'Atque hoc animadvertisse oportet quod, tametsi tum ipse Gordon cuius negotium erat, tum aliquot Consultores, inter causas nullitatis vindicandae etiam adduxissent illam prout putabatur ordinationem Parkerii in sententia tamen ferenda, omnino seposita est ea causa,' etc. (*Apostolicae Curae*).

Note that the phrase is not 'pseudo-ordinationem,' as in the Gordon case.

Why should Leo XIII deem that the case against Anglican Orders is rendered clearer by prescinding from the matter of the consecration of Parker, if that consecration were, in itself, invalid?

This is no forced construction of a document, each word of which is to be weighed, and not one of which was intended to be taken lightly. The Bull concludes: 'We decree that these letters, and all things contained therein, shall not be liable at any time to be impugned, or objected to, by reason of fault, or any other defect whatsoever, of subreption, or obreption, or of Our Intention, but shall always be valid and in force.'

With such a decision, the matter is ended for Roman Catholics, and, a refusal to consider the force of the documents that led to the prescinding from the case of Parker's consecration, would tend to precisely such a subreption, leading to the weakening of the structure of the Bull, as is contemplated and forbidden by its solemn close.

Let, then, the circumstances of the case be considered, remembering always that the Bull left open the thesis that the rite may have been valid, and the consecrator, a bishop with the ostensible intention to do that which the Catholic Church would effect at a consecration.

Only three bishops, occupants of sees, would seem to correspond

¹ *The Popes and the Ordinal*, p. 57.

to such description, Kitchen, Curwen, and Stanley, of whom the last two may, perhaps, be removed from consideration. 'Perhaps'; not safely, for, in discovery, no possibility may be ignored—yet, removed, for the moment—removed until the hints of Jewel and of Fulke be considered—removed until the last days of the career of Oglethorpe also can be carefully examined.

Elizabeth's aesthetic tastes inclined to the retention of the ceremonies of the Catholic Church, and her mind was appreciative of the effect of such ceremony, at her own coronation, and in the installation of the Churchmen who were to safeguard her claim to the throne by spiritual co-operation. She had considered the possibilities of Feckenham or of Wooton as archbishop. The resolute mind of Cecil had determined the appointment of Parker, as successor to Pole, long before the struggle with the hierarchy had resulted in the resignation, or deposition, of the great majority of the prelates.

The accounts of these resignations, and the creation of their successors, copied by one chronicler from the other, have fatal sources of inaccuracy. They repeat each other's errors, unexamined, and they are based on the gossip of the time. Machyn's Diary furnishes some particulars, which cannot be accepted without scrutiny, and some which are, apparently, so opposed to the record of the Lambeth Register, that they must be rejected as misleading, by those who uphold the authenticity of that record.¹ In general, his diary, if free

¹ The difficulties of Machyn's account disappear, if it be considered as what is technically termed, 'original' evidence; that is, if it be accepted, not as tending to show the truth of that which it reports, but as demonstrating that such a report existed.

'1559. The xxiii day of June was elected vi nuw byshopes com from beyond the sea, master Parker, byshope of canturbere, master Gryndall, bysshope of London, doctor Score, byshoppe of Harfford, Barlow of Chichester, doctor Bylle of Salysbere.'

Parker and Scory were not from beyond seas, and Bill was not elect of Salisbury.

'1559. The vi day of September the nuwe bysshope of London and dyver odur . . .'

The entry is left unfinished, but in the margin is the word, 'byshoppes.' The difficulty is serious. Machyn knew of the election of Grindal, and the confirmation of that prelate did not occur until months later. It is, of course, possible that Grindal was actually consecrated on the day alleged by Edwardine bishops, but, if so, whilst Mason receives support, the record of the Lambeth Register again appears at fault. It will be recalled that the Nag's Head Fable assigns the consecrations by Scory to the month of September.

The very important entry of December 17th is a portion of the diary that has suffered from the fire that damaged the Cottonian MSS., and in a portion wherein chronological order has not been observed, unless the writer has interpolated entries in his Diary.

Burnt portion. Then, ' . . . er elected byshope of Canturbure.'

'The xvii day of Desember was mad thar at Lambeth.'

What these words 'was mad thar' intend is not clear. Perhaps, the failure to complete was intentional, as in the case of the entry relative to Grindal and others. In fact, the entry does not appear to have been made, so far as these words were concerned, at the same time as the earlier part of the line. They are in different ink, and of different slope, and the ink of the 'h' in 'thar' crosses over a lead pencil entry, which may be, '1559.' The 'thar' is unneces-

from later emendations, can be accepted as an honest attempt of a rather ignorant man to record events in a terminology that leaves the effect of the events doubtful.

It is an attempt to record what Machyn had heard, by way of gossip at the time that he inscribed it. His evident partiality towards the old religion would have created difficulties to prevent him actually witnessing the religious rites that he records, and, in many cases, he seems ill-informed concerning the persons of the new régime.

More biassed, less trustworthy, are the groups of tales to which the name of the 'Nag's Head Fable' has been given. It would be uncritical to reject these accounts as totally destitute of elements of truth, or to concur in the estimates of the character of the narrators as of men of no standing, willing to bolster a case by deliberate fabrication. They were neither dishonest, nor of light repute: they were embittered and biassed by evil days, through which they had passed, and willing to attribute to their opponents, universally, sacrileges and outrages, of which individuals among them may have been capable. The tales of Champneys, Darbyshire, Neale, and of Wedderburn must be received, only as descriptions of events partially known, and described by witnesses anxious to criticize and belittle. Hence the 'ut probatur' of the *Apostolicae Curiae*.

Wedderburn is stated by Dixon to have been a friend of Bishops Hall and Bedell. He wrote from Spain, in 1615, letters which Bedell published with his own answers. Wedderburn alleges that some Reformation bishop was consecrated at the Nag's Head, with only one consecrating bishop, and that the consecration was followed by the ceremony at Lambeth, recorded in the register as of date, December 17, 1559. The kernel of Wedderburn's statement, as in every other variant of the 'Nag's Head Fable,' is the part played by the single bishop—presumably Kitchen. In the early rumours relating to Kitchen's act, the uncanonicity or illegality, of such a consecration is stressed; and Jewel makes clear that the English opinion of his day fully recognized the *desirability* of three bishops. Unfortunately, his language, as was doubtless intended, conveyed no information as to what actually occurred. In other variants of the tale, Kitchen is represented as deterred by threat of excommu-

sary; the 'm' of 'mad' separated from the 'a,' contrary to Machyn's usual practice. The spacing is quite noticeably larger than usual. The word 'mad' is also intruded into an entry of December 20th, relative to five new bishops, and may be Machyn's addition, intended to signify that a ceremony had taken place, of the nature of which he was not certain;—installation, or consecration.

nication, made by Bonner, and then derided by those who awaited consecration, and who had, theretofore, treated him with much reverence. To him they applied the terms, 'Old Fool' and the like, which White and other of the Roman Catholic party had certainly used at about the same period.

The form of the legend put forward by Gordon, the Scotch bishop received into the Roman Catholic Church, alleged that Kitchen avoided consecrating, pleading his age and defective eyesight.

The essential features of all the accounts, which need not be examined at length, since they are not cited as acceptable, are the allegation of the presence of Kitchen, his intent to use the ancient Pontifical, with the assent of Scory and others present (presumably, Barlow, Scory, and Grindal), the absence of the mention of Parker in the accounts, the prominence given to Scory, and the representation that Scory added to the ceremony, if any, already performed by Kitchen, a portion of the Edwardine rite.

The incorrect relation of a series of facts is by no means inconsistent with the facts having occurred, otherwise, in varied order, modified by other circumstance, and with addition of significant nature, omitted in the faulty narrative. With such safeguard, the 'Nag's Head Fable' may be utilized, to show that certain things were believed, certain rumours current, certain processes apprehended as likely or, indeed, inevitable. Among such are the compliance of Bishop Kitchen with the Royal Mandate to consecrate, and his use of the ancient Pontifical. Some light, contemporaneous, is thrown on the events of the last Sunday in October by the letter of Jewel to Josiah Simler, written upon November 2, 1559.¹ Jewel states that some of the consecrations had already taken place. The Lambeth Register would have it that none took place until six weeks later. So would the translator of the Parker Series, who cites the Latin of the letter correctly, but perverts the English, no doubt under unconscious bias. Jewel in the letter inveighs against the use of oil in the very terms that the Nag's Head bishops are reported to have used in reviling Kitchen. He promises Simler that its use would be discarded, a promise scarcely consistent with his allegations as to the use of the 'precious oil of the mercy of God' by him in the Visitation of the Sick, subsequent to his own episcopate.²

Here is the text of Jewel to Simler: 'quod scribis, sperare te epis-

¹ *Parker Society, Zurich Letters*, under date.

² *Parker Society*, 2 Jewel, 1103. Jewel, the bishop, was a very different man from the Jewel of 1558.

copos apud nos sine ullis superstitionis et putidis ceremoniis inaugurari, hoc est, opinor, sine oleo, sine chrismate sine, novacula; nihil falleris.¹

Jewel was in a position to know the facts. On that last Sunday in October, 1559, on which the consecration of Parker appears to have taken place, Jewel was about to re-enter London after a tiring tour. He came back on November 1st. In a letter of the following day, written to Peter Martyr, he says, 'Yesterday, as soon as I returned, I heard from the Archbishop of Canterbury, that you are invited hither, and that your old lectureship is kept open for you.' Not Dr. Parker, not 'the Archbishop-Elect' is the style, but Archbishop. This and the 'inaugurari' of the letter to Simler are consistent with consecration effected, and are opposed to a supposition of consecration-to-be.

The virulent opposition to the use of unction, expressed by Jewel, is accountable. He had conformed during the Marian period, and was suspect by the extremists thereafter. By nature, he was a facile, spitefully-humorous little man, with an impish inclination towards obscenity and occasionally to profanity—much to the regret of friends who admired his learning. Serle, the old enemy of Cranmer, prevailed on the elder Parkhurst to remove his son from Jewel's influence, but Cranmer's luckless son fell under it. Probably Jewel never troubled Parker by a single remonstrance concerning any matter of ritual whereon Parker had his own policy. Neither is it probable that Jewel did use unction for the sick. His terms suggesting that practice were intended merely to obtain an ambiguity and to serve a debating purpose. He knew, that Parker had been consecrated, he knew, no doubt, who had been ordered to consecrate him, and did not trouble to inquire how the command had been obeyed, or what ceremony had been used thereat. He presumed, 'omnia rite acta.'

It will be necessary to return from the November 2nd by which the consecration had taken place, and to consider the events preceding.

On Saturday, February 4, 1558-9, the Bill for the Restoration of the First Fruits was read for the third time. Kitchen and seven other bishops dissented. Tunstall, Poole of Peterborough, and Bourne of Bath and Wells were absent from Parliament; excused by the Queen, at their desire. On February 27th, the Bill for Restoring the Suprem-

¹ *Parker Society, Zurich Letters, Epistola xxii.*

acy was considered, and the debates ended on March 18th; two temporal lords, one abbot (Feckenham), and nine bishops (including Kitchen) dissenting. On March 22nd, the Bill returned from the Commons, and the voting of the spiritual peers, weakened in number by the faint-hearted three still temporizing, remained as previously. On April 4, 1559, the Bill for the exchange of the bishop's lands was read, and, upon this matter of mere temporal wealth, Kitchen did not vote.

By April 17th, Thirlby had returned from France. He was expected to favour the reforming interest, and was not averse from compromise that did not affect Eucharistic doctrine. With him returned Dr. Wotton, and to them was committed the Bill for Restoring 'the Ancient Jurisdiction,' that is, the Supremacy of the Crown. Once before, a similar trust reposed in Thirlby had induced him to guide through Parliament the Bill that enabled the wives of clergy to contract bigamous marriages. This time, his scruples of conscience prevailed over the instincts of the diplomat. On Wednesday, April 29th, Thirlby and nine other bishops voted against the Bill; with Feckenham and Viscount Montague. Two days previously, the Bill for the Uniformity of Common Prayer, to which Thirlby would certainly have shown opposition, had been opposed by Kitchen, the usual bishops, and nine temporal peers. From its operations, the Diocese of Sodor and Man, Stanley's, was excluded, and no portion of the Bill affected the services for the Ordination of Priests, or the Consecration of Bishops, save so far as the Mass required by the Pontifical was concerned. To the Bill, Parker was lukewarm;¹ but he was ready as always to say 'Yes' to Cecil.

The number of bishops who voted against the series of 'reforming' Bills will appear small. Fourteen bishops are generally named by the historians, as being those summoned to take the Oath of Supremacy, and refusing. From that number must be excluded Stanley, who, proceeding with his Pontifical High Masses, and generally disregarding the fact that a Reformation was in progress, was, with great discretion, equally disregarded by Cecil, who had no desire for a conflict with the potent house of Derby. Among the number is to be reckoned always Kitchen, who had voted and spoken against each step of change, in a fashion vigorous and independent

¹ *Parker Society, Parker.* Sandys writing to Parker, letters upon pp. 59, 60, assumes his ignorance of the liturgical changes.

for a man of his age. Six absentees from the episcopal bench can be accounted, and explained. Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph, had not received a Writ of Summons, thanked the Queen for the omission, and vacated the Realm in debt to Her Majesty. Thirteen were so left. White and Watson were in the Tower. White it was who, about this time, spoke of Kitchen as 'cracked' mentally. Eleven were thus left for account. Three had sought permission from Her Majesty, not to attend Parliament. Doubtless these three wished, at this stage, not to commit themselves to a marked and dangerous opposition, until the form, that alterations in religion were likely to take, had been settled—either in a fashion that they could accept, reluctantly, or in a form that they could reject, with credit to their religious consistency. Of the three, David Poole, Bishop of Peterborough, was not unfavourably regarded by Her Majesty. On December 28, 1558, he wrote to Cecil, thanking him for the gift of a buck and a doe, a frequent complimentary present towards those whose esteem the Secretary desired. In the same letter, Poole sends to the Queen his 'poor gift' of twenty marks, and begs that she will excuse his attendance at Parliament.

The second of those absent from Parliament was Gilbert Bourne, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and the third, Tunstall. Tunstall had found it possible to comply with all the Henrician changes of religion and to accept the Edwardine until the time of the promulgation of the revised Ordinal. He was certainly inclined to discuss the possibility of his retention of his bishopric in the New Order.

These three, Tunstall, Bourne, and Poole, were the bishops named by Elizabeth as those whom she desired to officiate at the consecration of Parker. The one that Parker desired, in especial, was Tunstall. The matter did not appear hopeless to him or to Cecil. It was true that Tunstall had desired to be excused from attendance both at Parliament and at the Coronation, but his duties at the latter ceremony had been performed by three 'meet persons appointed.'

Amidst so much uncertainty as to the response, likely to be shown by individual bishops, to pressure, the position of Thirlby and the three last-named prelates had, in especial, to be considered. Kitchen was almost beyond successful treatment. He had not taken out a licence from Edward VI, and had, by successful legal shifts, escaped the consequence. He had not received reconciliation from the Holy

See, in Marian days, and now he was exhibiting the cunning of an ancient fox in eluding the hounds, just as doom seemed like to overtake him. The shifts that had enabled him, almost alone among all abbots, to evade the issues at a trial for High Treason, in the days of the Pilgrimage of Grace, might once more avail him.

Thirlby was long protected. He had made many friends among adherents of the reforming cause. Elizabeth alone showed for him an aversion that arose from one of her genuine principles. She was a full-blooded patriot, and Thirlby had not only been luke-warm as to the loss of Calais, but had rather welcomed its acquisition by the French. Both he and Gardiner regarded outlying towns, such as were Calais and Boulogne, as the source of perpetual warfare and ill-will. Thirlby drank a tankard to the loss of Calais, declaring it 'but a fishing village gone.'

On May 15, 1559, the body of the prelates, fourteen in number, was called before the Queen in person, and ordered to take the Oath of 'Allegiance,' as Froude terms it (vii. 89), but, in reality, of Supremacy. Alternatively, the bishops should lose their sees. Froude then, inaccurately, represents Thirlby as returning from Cambrai, about June, whereas he had returned, very unexpectedly, for the meeting of the Parliament in the early spring, and had, as Feria wrote, on April 29th, disappointed the Reformers, by speaking in Parliament like a good Catholic. The pressure of May 15th proved inadequate. About June 20th, five bishops were summoned before the Council and the Oath was tendered to them, 'with great promises, and threats as well.' They refused, and were returned to the house of the Sheriff of London, whither were brought also, Watson and White from the Tower. They were greatly insulted and mocked at in the streets, and at last were ordered not to leave London until after September, and to go no further away than Westminster, under pain of £500 each, and they had to find bail for that amount. De Quadra in his letter of June 27th to Philip mentions that Thirlby, the Bishop of Ely, was summoned with the other five, but was afterwards told not to come until the Council sent for him again.

For the transactions that took place at this period, the principal account must be the contemporaneous but ill-informed record of Machyn's Diary. He has: 'The 21 day of June was five byshopps deprevyd; the byshopp of Lychfeld and Coventry and the byshoppe of carley, the byshoppe of westchester, the byshoppe of llandaffe and the byshoppe of . . .' With regard to Llandaff, Machyn was

certainly in error, in believing that Kitchen was deprived. But Machyn names the bishops, which De Quadra does not. Machyn would probably know the bishops who had been insulted in the streets, De Quadra would be more likely to be accurate in stating that they had not been deprived, but put on bail. Machyn continues: 'The 5 day of July was deposyd of their byshoperykes the archbyshope of York, dr. Heth, and the byshope of Ely, docthur Thurlbe, at my lord tresorer place at Freyrs Augustyne.' It is probable that Thirlby was deprived at about this date, since the last entry in his register is of June 21, 1559.

The watchful De Quadra was of opinion that Kitchen had not been deprived. On July 12th, he wrote to the King: 'The Bishop of Llandaff, who is a greedy old man with but little learning, is wavering, and it is feared he may take the oath, as he is wearing a bishop's garb again lately. On August 18th, De Quadra writes again: 'The Bishop of Ely has sent to say that he has asked for leave to come and see me sometime, but they have refused him.' The intended visit may have had special reference to the reunion projects then in Cecil's mind, projects in which he sought to engage Parker more than once, and in which De Quadra's successor found much of interest. De Quadra continues: 'It is certain they all stand more aloof from me than from the French. I think they are vexed at losing their pensions [i.e. the episcopal incomes] and this, together with our different views in religion, causes genuine enmity.'

It is remarkable that De Quadra should rate the views of bishops, since esteemed Catholics, and who then were losing their sees for opposition to the changes in religion, as not of the same intransigence of faith as his own.

De Quadra was partially right as to the compromise that Kitchen was effecting. The transaction is recorded by the Rev. John Lamb in his *History of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, with accuracy (save with respect to the number of bishops of the old hierarchy retained. Like all historians, Lamb fails to remember Stanley).

Since Lamb's work is rare, the letter is transcribed, prefixed by his comment, perspicacious and definite, conjoined with material that would have saved historians the repetition of error, had they but examined the original material he indicates, instead of summarizing each other's opinions.

Lamb writes: 'It has generally been stated that Kitchen took the Oath of Supremacy: but it appears that so anxious was Her Majesty

to retain, at least, one bishop, that she excused him from taking it, on a written pledge' that he would require the said oath from all others receiving ecclesiastical or temporal office in his diocese as the statute provided. The very document with Anthony Kitchen's signature is in the Manuscript Library of Corpus Christi College, and is as follows:

'Whereas the Queen's Majestie of her bountifull Grace tenderinge the quyet of my conscience hath deferred the rendering of thothē of her Supremacie to my further consideration within myself in thexpending of Goddes learnynge I doe assure Her Grace by these presentes subscribed by my hand that as a true and faythful subjecte to her Authoritie I shall for my own power, connyng, and habilitie set forth in my own person and cause all other under my jurisdiction to accept and obey the whole course of religion now approved in the state of Her Grace's Realme and shall also require the said othe of others Receiving office ecclesiastical or temporal as in the statute thereof provided; In Witnes whereof I have subscribed with my own hand the xviii th. daye of Julye in the first yere of the Reyne of the sayde Sovereigne Lady Elizabeth Queen of England France and Ireland, defender of the faith etc. Anthony Landaff.'

Lamb resumes: 'It is a curious fact that on the 18th of July, the very day on which Kitchen subscribed the document, Elizabeth signed the Letters Patent to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury to elect an archbishop. It seems Her Majesty would not take this step until she had secured one bishop.' (This sounds discourteous to the Edwardine bishops.)

There is quite a quantity of other curious fact about this letter. It is a State document, addressed to Her Majesty. It is found, not in the proper depository, but in that repository where so much else of Parker's gift is preserved. Kitchen plainly refuses to take the Oath himself, but would accept it from others. So would any reforming bishop have done, had such reformer been substituted for Kitchen. What was the particular value of *his* promise to accept the Oath from others, were it not from Parker that the Oath was to be taken?

Note the unmistakable refusal of the Oath, after every delay had been given for decision, and the characteristic compromise of an offer that might avoid the recusant's deposition. Had that offer not been complied with, had not a genuine advantage been tendered to the Queen, and had not that advantage accrued, by Parker's con-

secration, does there exist any feasible explanation why Kitchen was not deprived with the others of the hierarchy, such as Poole and Bourne, who clung to the last to their diocesan positions?

Kitchen's refusal to yield in the least, as to his own personal conviction, in the matter of the Supremacy, is shown in the trifle, the use of the 'etc.' in the Queen's style. This must have been deliberate. It would not have been thus shortened by Martin Button, the bishop's secretary, who was, of all his Llandaff entourage, the least attached to the older religion. The 'etc.' already was a definite party badge, an implied refusal to use the term 'Supreme Governor of the Church of England,' where such title would, but for the 'etc.,' have been formally needed.¹ On January 30, 1559, Parliament had considered the effect of that 'etc.' On February 3rd, Mr. Carrol reported to a committee of twenty-four members that the omission of the words, 'Supremum Caput Ecclesiae' did not impeach the validity of Writs of Summons to Parliament, wherein, in Marian days, the 'etc.' had been used to avoid the Queen's scruples in the assumption of the title as applied to her. Hence the significance attachable to the 'etc.,' and Kitchen's purpose in obtruding it on Elizabeth.

The Mandate for the Election of Parker was fulfilled by a minority of the Chapter of Canterbury. It is strange that Ralph Jackson, one of the recalcitrant majority, absent from the electing body, and pronounced 'contumacious' for that reason, is named by the compiler of the Lambeth Register as a witness to the 'Instrumentum super Consensum Domini Electi.' In that capacity, which he would have been so unlikely to have fulfilled, the Lambeth Register styles this canon and prebendary, incorrectly, as 'clericus.'

A slight inaccuracy, such as that, should not be allowed to weigh too heavily against the register. Nor should the unlikelihood of Jackson's presence. No doubt, he would have been present, had the circumstances been different and had the events recorded by the register occurred.

During the next few weeks, and until the third week in October, every possible pressure was brought to bear upon Tunstall, Gilbert Bourne, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and David Poole, the Bishop of Peterborough, to act as three of the bishops, of whom Kitchen was to be the fourth, in the consecration of Parker.

¹ Sebastian Westcott, the Catholic priest whom Elizabeth protected in his refusals to take the Oath, and retained in a privileged position in her Chapel Royal, uses the 'etc.' in his will of 1582.

By September 9, 1559, Parker must have been of opinion that, not only Kitchen, but Tunstall, Bourne, and Poole would act as his consecrators. Four bishops appeared to have been requisite under Statute Law, where none of them was a Metropolitan within the King's dominions.

The Archbishop-Elect had the right to name for the office of consecrators such as he would select on the ground of personal amity, eminent holiness, or for such other special reason as might move him thereto.

His special choice was Tunstall.

That Tunstall would insist on the use of the Pontifical was obvious; his votes and speeches in Parliament, and the tenour of his acts forbade any other supposition. Strype avouches that he saw in the State Paper Office the draft of the Royal Assent for Parker's consecration, and that, at the time of his inspection, one, and only one, name appeared on the document, that of Tunstall, and that the name was in Parker's writing.¹ It must be concluded that the other names were to Parker of less import, and that they were, probably, filled by Cecil or Bacon.

Sir Nicholas Bacon accompanied the Royal Assent with a letter to Parker, cordial, bearing in mind the lack of friendship between the two men. 'I send Your Grace the Royal Assent, sealed and delivered within two hours after the receipt thereof, wishing unto you as good success therein as ever happed to any that have received the like. From Redgrave, 9 September, 1559, by your grace's assuredly, N. Bacon.'

This '*Regalis Assensus pro Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi*'² is duly authenticated: 'In cuius rei testimonium, etc. Teste Regina apud Redgrave nono die Septembris Per Breve de Privato Sigillo,' and is an undeniable public document, of very different character from the later '*Assent*' of consecration that figures in the Lambeth Register.

In the earlier document, the four names that are contained serve a logical purpose. The persons named could fulfil their office legally, and could effect a consecration that would be regarded as valid and canonical, abroad. None of the proposed consecrators were under any canonical inhibition or disability, such as would prevent him acting. But the *Regalis Assensus* is addressed not only to '*Reverendis in Christo Patribus; Cuthberto Dunelmensi, Epo.; Gilberto, Batho*

¹ Strype's *Parker*, *E.H.S.*, i. 106.

² Patent 1 Eliz., pt. ii, m. 1.

niensi, Epo.; David, Burgi Sancti Petri, Epo.; Antonio, Landavensi Epo.' To these names follow those of 'Willielmo Barlo, Episcopo, et Johannes Scory, Episcopo.'

Are the added names part of the original document? They destroy the basis of intent; they are not the names of bishops of sees, and neither was regarded by Elizabeth as a bishop competent to consecrate. On October 26, 1559, six weeks after the date at which Her Majesty is supposed to have included the names in the Royal Assent, she wrote to the Lord Treasurer and others: 'Whereas the Archbishop-Elect of Canterbury, and the other elect Bishops of London, Ely, Hereford, and Chichester *remain unconsecrated*, etc.' Here it is stated that Parker, Grindal, Coxe, Scory, and Barlow were unconsecrated. Whether Barlow and Scory were, in fact, unconsecrated, is, here, nothing to the purpose. The point is that, rightly or wrongly, the Queen, and Cecil, in whose writing the last paragraph of the letter is, believed them unconsecrated, and that it would have been a lunatic act to have named as consecrators, men whom Elizabeth believed unconsecrated. An inference might be drawn that, if these names are part of the *Regalis Assensus* of September 9th, they were added to the document at a date later than the October 26th of the Queen's letter, and that the intent was that they should be consecrated earlier than Parker, and then assist at his consecration.

If this inference were to be adopted, it would be necessary to find a Royal Assent for the consecration of Barlow and Scory, earlier than October 26th, and this has not, apparently, existed.

A second explanation would be found in the supposition that the addition of the names to the Royal Assent was made by Bacon who had not given to the matter of consecration and canonicity the same careful attention as Cecil had. Whoever added the names was unaware of the sees to which Barlow and Scory were elect, or else aware of the legal incapacities of the bishops-elect to perform the office named in the Assent, and not desirous of stating their precise disqualifications—'resigned, deprived, and unconfirmed, possibly unconsecrated.'

Then and now, there appears some misapprehension as to the law upon the subject, although that misapprehension is not biassed contention arising from any controversy, or from any consecration to which the strict construction of the law would apply.

An Act of 23 Hen. VIII had dealt with the payment of Annates

to Rome, and had provided that, in the case of the voidance of an archbishopric, the archbishop-elect could be consecrated, without the assent of Rome, by an archbishop, and such bishops as were his customary assistants. In default of the existence of an archbishop, competent and willing to perform the office, two bishops should act as consecrators. No doubt the intention of the Act was that two bishops should replace the archbishop. But, as the Act is penal, and against liberty, it must be construed strictly, and in favour of any one who could be subjected to its penalties.

This was not Cecil's interpretation. He was a Churchman, and desired canonicity, and sought four bishops. The Act, to which reference has been made, for the prevention of the payment of Annates to Rome, was incorporated in 25 Hen. VIII, cap. 20, sec. 1. This Act was repealed in the sweep of Marian legislation, but, prior to Parker's consecration, had been re-enacted by 1 Eliz., cap. 1, sec. 4.

The fourth section of the statute of 25 Hen. VIII had further provided that, in the event of the vacancy of an archbishopric, the mandate to consecrate could be addressed to any metropolitan in His Majesty's dominions. Whether this provision was not noted by Cecil (which is unlikely) or whether Hugh Curwen, who later was the Protestant Bishop of Oxford, was unwilling to leave Dublin, and change his religion, at this period, is uncertain. If Cecil overlooked the effect of the clause, it is improbable that Bacon would also have done the like.

Although it was possible that three bishops would suffice as consecrators, the *Significavit* had to be addressed to four by the provisions of section v, sub-sec. 6, of cap. 20 last cited. Hence the name of Kitchen was a necessary addition to those of Tunstall, Bourne, and Poole. Complaint has been made by Church of England controversialists to the effect that 'by some extraordinary oversight,' the clause whereby any four of the bishops named should be enabled to act was omitted from the mandate of September 9, 1559. Had such a clause existed, the document would be rightly suspect, as is that unauthenticated document, alleged to be of December 6th, and contained in the Lambeth Register.

A monarch, issuing such a *Significavit*, presumes that the recipients will carry out the order; the more especially when that order is backed by penalties, the heaviest known to law, save only the punishment of death; which some writers would believe included.

The mandate should have been executed in fourteen days. By September 27th, eighteen days after the issue of the mandate, Tunstall had not consented to the functions required of him. He was ordered to close confinement, wherein no man save Parker, or such as he should delegate, should have access to the aged bishop.¹ Five days of the treatment yielded great hope. On October 2nd, Tunstall was still undeprived, and hopes of his restoration to grace and to his bishopric were held out to him.² By October 5th, Cecil had abandoned hopes, said that he saw no sudden remedy for the defection of Tunstall,³ and from this time dates his belief (unfounded in fact) that four bishops could not be found to act as consecrators. Of course, he was unwilling to recruit from the ranks of the many suffragans, such as John Salisbury and Hodgkins who held no sees, or his dilemma would have had no foundation.

With Tunstall had gone Bourne and Poole. These two had probably intended to follow the lead of Tunstall, and did so.

They were deprived at about the same time as he, when their obduracy was well ascertained. A Commission to tender the Oath of Supremacy, issued on October 18th, terminated Bourne's tenure of the See of Bath and Wells.⁴ Poole was deprived at about the same date, for by the 11th of November the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury were administering the Diocese of Peterborough.

Meanwhile, it must be presumed that Kitchen had not wavered in his intent to consecrate Parker. He had, as has been mentioned, resumed the episcopal habit, and was still subject to the terms of the order that bound him not to leave Westminster. Oglethorpe, at that time expecting his restoration to favour, dwelt on the Westminster boundary, at his house in Chancery Lane.⁵ If Kitchen failed to consecrate, the Act of Henry VIII, so often cited, rendered him liable to the forfeiture of all his goods and chattels, and himself to be at the mercy of the Queen. From those who had refused, the penalty had been exacted. Bourne and Poole suffered life-long imprisonment, Tunstall escaped only by death. The mere fact that Kitchen retained his office, and received therein no ordinary consideration, is indication of what he proposed and what he did. It is uncertain whether any other assisted Kitchen at the consecration of Parker. Cecil, in his quandary, caused a list of spiritual men, apt for

¹ *Parker Society's Correspondence*, p. 77. ² *Ibid.* ³ *Ibid.*, p. 78. ⁴ *Rymer*, xv. 545.

⁵ The Mitre public house may derive its title from the adjacent residence.

the duty, to be prepared. Amongst them was the name of Barlow. It is strange that his name should be considered at this date, if, in fact, his name had previously appeared on the contemporaneous document of September 9th—six weeks earlier—as one conjoined in co-operation with Tunstall and the rest. His recommendation, in the list, is that he had been a bishop in Queen Mary's days; note not in those of Henry VIII.

His recognition as a bishop by Pole is implied. It is true that he had been suffered to resign by Mary's counsellors, and had not been termed 'pretensed' bishop, as had been the consecrands of Edwardine days. He possibly had received consecration as a suffragan at some time, and hence the mystery that has surrounded his status; one that troubled Elizabeth. In addition to Barlow, there were Scory, Coverdale (who, possibly, was an ancient suffragan; but who would not, in 1559, have consented to the use of the ancient rite), Bale of Ossory, whose Orders were Edwardine of the reformed sort, Curwen and Stanley, whose unwillingness could scarcely be the matter of doubt, Hodgkins, who had countenanced the coarse vituperation of Elizabeth as a bastard, and had preached at Paul's Cross to assert the claims of Lady Jane Grey. He was deprived of his London living at Cornhill, and treated as a simple cleric by Grindal, his diocesan. A host of other suffragans existed; among them John Salisbury of Thetford, Sparke of Berwick, and Pursglove of Hull, who was attached to the ancient religion. All these appeared from one cause or another unsuitable and do not appear in the list of 'spiritual men,' and Elizabeth pressed for an immediate fulfilment of her mandate.

When Elizabeth pressed a point, something usually gave way. An ingenious pretext was found for delay. The exchange of bishop's lands, whereby the Crown was to render back some portion of the temporalities seized, was declared not complete. Elizabeth listened to the explanation with anger and growing impatience. There was an aged and compliant bishop, willing to carry out her behests; why wait? She indited a letter, of which only the last paragraph is in Cecil's handwriting. This letter, previously quoted, is addressed to the Barons of the Exchequer, and is dated October 26, 1559. It begins, 'Whereas the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other elect Bishops of London, Ely, Hereford, and Chichester'—the last-named, William Barlow—'remain unconsecrated, by reason that the exchange is not finished between us and them, our pleasure is that ye

shall with all expedition proceed to finish the said exchange. And these our letters shall be your sufficient warrant and discharge in this behalf.' Which should really put an end to any controversy whether Elizabeth deemed Barlow a bishop, canonically consecrated and likely to be accepted by a General Council, as a fit consecrator for Parker.

It may well be that she was misinformed, but her opinion must also have been that of Cecil, who concluded the letter in business-like style, and was officially cognisant of its terms and despatch. The tone of confidence in the possibility of the consecrations being effected, immediately, is quite inconsistent with the account in the Lambeth Register of a consecration postponed until two months later. No hint is given at any time of any delay that followed this peremptory royal order, no suggestion is to be found of Kitchen's unwillingness to perform the ceremony, no mention anywhere made of the eccentric consecrators assigned by the Register to the function of December 17th. Parker's letters and the State Papers manifest the like ignorance of the events recorded in the Register. Parker's correspondence is ample. It evidences the mandate to consecrate in September, omits the alleged mandate of December, shows always a definite intent to effect the consecration in October, and not in December, and supplies evidence that the act did take place at that time.

Immediately after the date that has been suggested for the consecration, October 29th, that is the Sunday following the Queen's insistent letter, Parker would have been enabled to exercise legally, and without appeal, on the ground of lack of due authority, the powers that had been invested in him by Letters Patent, dated October 20th. These have given much trouble to those who have accepted December 17th as the date of the consecration. The Letters Patent run as follows: 'The Queen To the Most Reverend Father in Christ, Matthew Archbishop of Canterbury And To Edmund Bishop of London and Richard Bishop of Ely, Francis Knolles, Kt., Vice-Chancellor, Ambrose Cave, Kt., Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster,' etc. (to the number of nineteen), 'Whereas . . . certain persons have refused conformity to Rites, Ceremonies, and Divine Service—prescribed by Law and Injunctions . . . We have assigned' to any four of you, of whom one of the bishops named must be present, 'power to accept from Archbishops, Bishops and ecclesiastical persons of all grades Oath upon the Gospels as in the form of the Act.'

The date of this document is fixed beyond the hazard of a peradventure, by the inclusion of the name of William May, the Dean of St. Paul's, subsequently Archbishop-Elect of York. He died on August 8, 1560. The October 20th can, therefore, be only October 20, 1559. That is the date that accords with its inclusion among the Letters Patent of the first year of Elizabeth.¹

Admitting this, and the obvious intention of the document, in its five references to Parker as Archbishop, and not as Archbishop-Elect, the question will at once arise, 'Were Grindal and Coxe consecrated at the same time as Parker?' Elizabeth's letter demands the consecration of Scory, Barlow, Grindal, and Coxe forthwith. Lingard is of opinion that Grindal and Coxe were consecrated at about this date.² The form of confirmation of Grindal and Coxe lead to a like assumption. Grindal is to be found, at a period not much later, as a proxy for Kitchen in Parliament, conjoined in that task with Cheney of Gloucester, the one member of the hierarchy who asserted consistently definite views on a Real Presence in the Eucharist. The selection of Grindal as proxy may indicate a closer friendship between him and Kitchen than their known divergency of views would warrant as assumption. Further, Grindal is stated by Mason to have been consecrated prior to the remainder of the Elizabethan bishops,³ and this statement was made before the authority of the Lambeth Register was asserted. There is a case for the suggestion that Grindal and Coxe were consecrated on October 29th, by Kitchen. On the other hand, Mason may be correct in his assertion that Grindal was consecrated by Harley and others. The only difficulty is that no evidence of the survival of Harley, to the date named, exists.

What as to Barlow and Scory? Both were apparently willing to be conjoined with Tunstall and the other bishops of September 9th in the use of the old Pontifical.

Barlow did presumably assist Kitchen at the consecration of October 29th. Jewel's statements are consistent with more than one of the old hierarchy having effected the consecration. Scory is represented always as having separated himself from the act, or as having been refused consecration by Kitchen. In the absence of documentary evidence, no guess can be hazarded as to him.

Next, in what capacity did Kitchen officiate; as Bishop of Llandaff, or as archbishop of that see? The antiquarian-minded Parker treated

¹ 1 Eliz., p. ii, m. 3 dorso. ² Lingard's letter of December, 1834. ³ *De Minist.*, p. 393.

the see as archiepiscopal, at the time of the consecration of Kitchen's successor, and he was not alone in such treatment. Defoe in his *Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain* refers to the fact that the Bishop of Llandaff was called an archbishop. The point seems to have received some insistence in the early years of Queen Elizabeth. The writ for the consecration of Jewel was addressed to the archbishops and bishops, etc. This is contrary to usual custom, in the Province of Canterbury, wherein the writs are addressed to the archbishop and bishops. The document, which is 'per Breve et Privato Sigillo,' of date December 27, 1559, was not sent to 'the archbishops' by any inadvertence, for the Archbishopric of York was vacant, and the subsequent language of Jewel, defending his Orders against Harding, is consistent only with his own consecration by Kitchen. To that language, and to the contemporaneous statements as to the action of Kitchen, we shall arrive in a following chapter.

Whilst the assistants of Kitchen at the consecration cannot be established by evidence, some help is afforded by subsequent fact. Three persons, duly summoned, were notably absent from Parker's confirmation, and supplied no proxies. They are stated, in the deed of confirmation, to have been among those to whom the directions to consecrate Parker issued, and the form of that direction is neither that of the Royal Assent of September 9th, nor that unauthenticated and contained in the Lambeth Register as of date December 6th. These three, absent (like Parker) from the confirmation, were John Salisbury, Suffragan-Bishop of Thetford, Bale of Ossory, and Kitchen. Of them, Salisbury received promotion, succeeding Stanley in the Diocese of Sodor and Man, and holding *in commendam* the wealthy Deanery of Norwich. Bale planted himself comfortably at Canterbury, and lived there more respectably than at any time theretofore in his life of many vicissitudes.

Contrast with these three, all in Royal favour, and all who had, if the Lambeth Register be accurate, refused compliance with Elizabeth's peremptory commands, contrast their fate with that of the alleged consecrators named in the Lambeth Register. Coverdale, in poverty and need, sought Grindal's intercession to procure from Cecil a pittance.¹ Parker did not even trouble to reply to 'Master Coverdale,' nor to listen to his complaint that he had been deprived

¹ 'If poor old Miles be provided for, enough is as good as a feast' (Coverdale to Grindal, February 6, 1564). Grindal, who feared that Evans, the Papist, would succeed Kitchen, tried in vain to place Coverdale in the See of Llandaff in December, 1563. Parker had quite other views. (*Parker Society, Grindal's Remains*, p. 283.)

of the Bishopric of Exeter. Hodgkins, the supposed source of Orders for so many Reformation bishops, was deprived of his rich London living, and relegated to Laindon in Essex, where he died. Grindal's Register duly records his death, as that of John Hodgkins, 'clericus.' Surely, had he consecrated Parker and Grindal, the latter would have been aware that Hodgkins was a suffragan-bishop. Surely, Parker's registrar would have known whether the name of the 'Bishop of Bedford' was John or Richard.

If amity, preferment, and protection were the likely marks of Parker's relation to those who served him and Cecil and the Queen, 'in circumstances more untoward than could be suddenly rectified,' Kitchen, John Salisbury, and Barlow are sufficiently indicated.

CHAPTER IV

CONTEMPORANEOUS WITNESSES TO THE REAL FACTS OF PARKER'S CONSECRATION, BY KITCHEN

THE test of the accuracy of the result of a logical induction is, that the fact established will explain other phenomena than those from which the result was induced. If, therefore, Parker were consecrated on October 29th, at Bow Church,¹ or elsewhere, by Kitchen, certain facts, otherwise inexplicable, should, at once, be rendered likely, natural, and sequent. Such are the facts of Parker's Grant of Arms, and the form of his *Summaria Petitio*. This document, filed before the confirmation of an archbishop, recites the facts of his birth, his age, his character for gravity and virtue, and names the grants to be made to him, confirmation, investiture, consecration, etc. In the case of Parker, the request for consecration is omitted, and that deliberately, and is also omitted from a quotation from the Letters Patent authorizing the consecration and confirmation.

The force of paragraph II of this document, the *Summaria Petitio*, is so consistent with a consecration effected by Kitchen, prior to December 9th, and so inconsistent with any other theory, that it should be read with attention to every word. It is addressed to Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, John of Bedford, 'unacum John, Suffragan of Thetford, and Bale of Ossory.' The use of the word 'unacum' has its significance, since this word accompanies the list of bishops in another frequently-cited document. It will be noted that Kitchen is omitted from the list of bishops, at the very time that mention of consecration, to be effected, is also omitted. Kitchen had fulfilled his function and was no longer necessary. Hence the Letters Patent quoted, addressed to the group of bishops concerned in the receipt of the petition. These Letters Patent, marked by the use of the word 'unacum' are frequently cited, as has been mentioned, but are not to be found, apparently. The wording is not that of any Letters Patent heretofore quoted or named.

Here are the words of the *Petitio*: 'Item quod dicta Serendissima Domina nostra Regina vobis Reverendis Patribus antedictis, de

¹ Lambeth Palace was not an ordinary place of consecration for an archbishop. Bow Church was a peculiar in the archiepiscopal jurisdiction. The late verger, an acute student of local history, pointed out that the expenditures in the Churchwardens' Accounts showed the assembly of large numbers of clergy.

assensu et consensu suis Regiis huiusmodi electionis (ut premittitur) adhibitis per litteras suas patentes inscriptas et directas non solum significavit, verum etiam earundem litterarum suarum patentium Serie vobis rogando mandavit Quatenus vos electionem predictam et eundem electum Confirmare ipsumque episcopalibus Insigniis insignare et decorare Ceteraque peragere quae vestre in hac parte incumbunt Officiis Pastoralibus iuxta Formam Statuti in ea parte editi et provisi et litterarum potentium huius modi velitis cum favore.'

The quotation in the *Summaria Petitio* is from a Royal Assent to the consecration and investiture of Parker. It does not agree in terms with the form of Assent contained in the Lambeth Register, and suggests the possibility that a second Royal Assent, omitting the names of Tunstall, Bourne, and Poole, was actually issued, prior to October 29th, and that such Assent was made to include the names of Kitchen, Barlow, Scory, John Salisbury, and Bale; the names of the latter, not English diocesan bishops, being preceded by the word 'unacum.' The absence of three of these from the confirmation, and their retention in office and in preferment, would be, as has been urged previously, inexplicable had they not fulfilled the behests certainly addressed to them. Having discharged their office their participation in remaining proceedings was unnecessary.

Not only did Parker not request consecration from the alleged consecrators named in the Lambeth Register, he acted as a consecrated bishop during the interval between October 29th and December 9th.

As Archbishop of Canterbury, he was entitled to impale the arms of the see, with the pallium. To the latter he was entitled under the Statute of Annates. The body proper to adjudicate concerning arms, under the Earl Marshal, is the College of Arms, and the patent enabling Parker to make the addition, legally and properly, issued on November 28, 1559, nearly three weeks before the events recorded in the Lambeth Register as 'consecration.'

Naturally the acts of Parker as archbishop-consecrate, during the period of six weeks prior to his confirmation, necessitated the use of the title archbishop, in lieu of that of archbishop-elect but rarely. The latter title might have been justified, as Champney stated, as perfectly correct in use under the provisions of the Statute so often cited.¹ Both titles were, in fact, used, after October 29, 1559.

¹ 'Non potest ex eo, quod Parkerus dicatur Archiepiscopus electus, colligi illum non fuisse tunc omnino sacratum, sed tantum non fuisse in sua Cathedra inthronizatum' (*De Vocatione Minist.* cap. xiv, p. 506).

Jewel, as has been seen, uses the title 'archbishop' concerning Parker.

More important and weighty is the legal document, by which Parker was commanded to tender the Oath of Supremacy.¹ 'My Lord of Canterbury, his good grace' was ordered by Cecil and Sir Thomas Parry to offer the Oath, to Dr. Boxall, the esteemed humanitarian, and Parker, his friend, was enjoined to proceed to the penalties of forfeiture of all Boxall's livings. Had Parker not been archbishop, consecrated, Dr. Boxall, who had been a Privy Councillor, and who is described by Cecil as a wise and learned man, would not have suffered the flagrant misdescription of his judge, but would have invoked the inhibitions of the Chancery against such an obvious breach of law.

On November 9th, the Lords of the Council enjoined Archbishop Parker to deal with two cases of a refusal to take the Oath before the Earl of Westmorland. This act was expressly committed to Parker under the Commission of October 20th, drawn up immediately before his consecration, apparently in anticipation of it, and not utilized until shortly after.

On December 9th, occurred the confirmation of Parker, at Bow Church, and the following day he is styled in the records of his Courts of Probate, 'Archbishop, consecrated and confirmed,' by the very registrars who are alleged, in the Lambeth Register, to have witnessed a consecration a week or so later.

From December 9, 1559, conclusions as to the true day of his consecration must be derived from the deductions made in a former chapter, and by observation of the date used by Parker, himself, in computing the commencement of the years of his consecration, and by noting occasional references in his correspondence.

The most interesting of these latter sources is in the course of a letter to Grindal.

In March, 1575, Grindal, then Archbishop of York, had occasion to write to Parker concerning one, Lowth, or Lowther, and his disordered dealings. 'I think,' he says, 'it will fall forth that he was never ordained priest or minister; and yet hath he these fifteen or sixteen years exercised that function. I hear that he maketh suit for a pardon from the Queen's majesty, or your grace, for this offence, which is very intolerable. I pray your grace, stay it if you can.'²

A very proper letter, and one that shows more belief in the

¹ *Parker Society*, Nov. 2, 1559, p. 104.

² *Parker Society, Grindal's Remains*, p. 353.

necessity of Orders for exercising the function of priest, or minister, than would usually be ascribed to Grindal. Note the fifteen or sixteen years back from March, 1575. It put Parker thinking of the events of 1559.

He refers to the attempts to secure the deposition of the Bishop of Ely, to the ill-will of Sandys, and then, after his fashion, recurs to the matter in his mind. 'For the matter itself' (the matter of Sandys' chatter against Coxe and Parker himself, apparently) 'I do not care three chips, for aught that can be proved in my allegiance, doing it so faithfully and prudently as I did, and would do the same again if I knew no more than I did at that time.'¹ With which rather mysterious reference to a past event, this excerpt from Parker's correspondence may be left.

The next witness as to the manner of the consecration of Parker is Bishop Jewel. He was interrogated closely by his opponent Harding. In his *Defence of the Apology* Jewel makes reply. He avails himself of every trick of the controversialist. He tells the truth in the exact form that he can prove it, and gives to his opponent a minimum of information. He is asked to produce the Register of Consecration, and makes no reference to its existence. Harding suggests to him the name of Kitchen, and Jewel will reply neither, 'Yea,' nor 'Nay.' But the name of Barlow does not once arise, his existence seems to have been forgotten by both antagonists. He may be included in one astonishing passage, in which Jewel does refer to both Kitchen and Stanley, in the very highest terms; terms as unexpected as those that recorded the commendation of Kitchen by the Protestant heretic whom he condemned in the days of Mary.

Let the two controversialists speak for themselves. Thus Harding: 'How many bishops can you reckon . . . your predecessors in order before you, of your opinion? If you can prove no succession, then whereby hold you? Will you show us the Letters Patent of the prince? Well may they stand you in some stead before men; before God they shall serve you to no purpose. Show us the register of your bishops continually succeeding one another from the beginning, so as that the first bishop have some one of the Apostles for his predecessor.

'You bear yourself as though you were Bishop of Salisbury. Who hath laid hands on you? By what example hath he done it?

¹ Letter of Parker to Grindal, his last to that Archbishop, and written with a knowledge of impending death, March 17, 1575.

How and by whom are you consecrated? Who gave you Orders? The institution of a priest was never yet but in the power of a bishop. Bishops have always, after the Apostles' time, according to the ecclesiastical canons, been consecrated by three other bishops, with the consent of the Metropolitan and the confirmation of the Bishop of Rome.¹

'Leaving other things, if there be no Church where is no priest, where is your Church like to become, after that the apostates that now be fled from us unto you shall be departed this life?'

A further allusion to the 'apostates' is made by Harding in another passage: 'As by Aristotle, a city cannot consist of bastards, no more can the Church of England consist of such bastard bishops as ye be. One must I still except, who is a true bishop by consecration (as I understand) though a false man by apostasy, and going from his faith and his religion.'²

Here is an explicit denial of the Orders of Jewel, made, as Harding evidently believed, in the lifetime of Kitchen. Jewel does not undeceive him, but most culpably replies as if Kitchen were still alive.

He does not reply, 'Kitchen consecrated me, with the ancient rite,' as he certainly could have done, had the facts been such as would have permitted the answer, but he does reply that he had been consecrated by the archbishop and other bishops.³ He shirks the question as to the consecration of the archbishop, and replies as to his confirmation,⁴ not his consecration. In this he was justified. He had personal knowledge of one fact and not of the other, which had occurred immediately before Jewel's return to London. From him, the spontaneity of a historian, supplying information, could not be expected. He manifests rather the guarded duplicity of a theologian, suspicious of a possible trap. However, he is entitled to be heard in his own words: 'We deny not the consecration of three bishops. We deny not the confirmation of the Metropolitan. We ourselves are so consecrated, and so confirmed. The matter that lieth between us is this, "Whether through the whole Church of

¹ *Parker Society, Jewel*, iii, pp. 320-22. ² *Ibid.*, *Jewel*, iv, p. 908.

³ He mentions always three bishops. The Lambeth Register has four—but that number includes Hodgkyns, whom Jewel apparently had not met, before or since; or, perhaps, then.

⁴ Le Courayer explaining a like omission by Stowe: 'Perhaps he thought it unnecessary enough to have mentioned Parker's election, without speaking of his consecration. . . . They did but renew what had been done in the time of King Edward' (p. 54; Oxford, 1844).

Christ no man may be allowed for a bishop without the confirmation of the Pope.”¹

‘Again that you [i.e. Harding] say, “A bishop hath always been consecrate by other three bishops.” I say that is an ordinance made by man. For Paul, when he ordered Titus and Timotheus sought not about for two other bishops. Further, ye demand of me, “Whether I be a bishop or no.” I answer you, I am a bishop, and that by the free and accustomed canonical election of the whole chapter of Salisbury assembled solemnly together for that purpose, of which number you were one.’²

‘I am a priest, made long since by the same order and ordinance, and I think also by the same man and the same hands, that you Mr. Harding were made priest.

‘Therefore, we neither have bishops without church, nor church without bishops. Neither does the Church of England this day³ depend on them you often call apostates. They are no apostates, Mr. Harding; they are for a great part, learned and grave and godly men, and are much ashamed to see your follies. Notwithstanding were there not one of them, nor of us, left alive, yet would not the whole Church of England flee to Louvaine. Be there but three together, and though they be laymen, yet is there a Church.’

It will be noted that, although Jewel states that consecration by one bishop is defensible, he does not allege that it has occurred in the Reformation changes. That he should have gone out of his way to defend the validity of such a consecration is to be noted, and weighed. That he should have described the bishops, left from the ancient succession, as learned, grave, and godly men, would seem to imply that there were at least three of them. Personal piety has never been denied to Kitchen, but who were the learned and grave? Of Stanley, gravity has never been affirmed. Our last glimpse of him is his sojourn in old age, in the Diocese of Durham, ‘living merrily as Pope Joan.’⁴ Barlow has never been reputed learned. It must be presumed that the suffragans remaining from the old succession were in Jewel’s mind.

And what was in his mind is of the utmost importance, when it is remembered that he could have supplied, in a line of print, the

¹ This and succeeding passages are extracts from *Parker Society*, vol. iii, *Jewel*, pp. 330 and onwards.

² Jewel is incorrect; Harding was not one.

³ The force of, ‘this day,’ unnecessarily intruded, is, that Kitchen was dead, to the knowledge of Jewel, and not to the knowledge of Harding.

⁴ *Parker Society*, *Parker*, p. 222. The footnote in the Parker Series is an obvious error.

answer to the question on which hundreds of books have since been written, the central question of this thesis: 'Who consecrated Parker?' That he should have accepted Harding's reference to Kitchen's undoubtedly valid episcopate, eulogised character, where character had been aspersed, and included in the general reference of eulogy others of the ancient succession, to whom Harding had not made reference, and of whose existence Jewel warns him, significantly, in this controversy on the source of Orders, is important, and indicative.

The suffragans who survived from the older succession, and who had been consecrated by an unquestioned form, were: Thomas Sparke, Bishop of Berwick;¹ Robert Pursglove, Bishop of Hull;² Thomas Morley, Bishop of Marlborough;³ John Bradley, Bishop of Shaftesbury;⁴ Thomas Manning, Bishop of Ipswich;⁵ and perhaps, a John, Bishop of Dover.⁶ Hodgkins was dead, prior to the writing of *The Defence of the Apology*, and the four last-named were all men of obscurity. Of the others, John of Dover alone has been alleged, by early Anglican writers, to have assisted at Parker's consecration.

To their number must be added John Salisbury, Bishop of Thetford, the whole tenour of whose life had been passed in forwarding a cautious and moderate Reformation. Although a Benedictine, he handfasted a constant companion, whom he once describes as his wife, and who did not take his name. He was deprived in 'Marian' days. By a little stretch of terms, he could be included in the 'learned men.'⁷ Sparke had written a book of controversy. Pursglove was Archdeacon of Nottingham, and Provost of the College of Rotherham. He probably served a good purpose in a district where discontented members of the older religion still valued the presence of Marian priests. He appears on the brass of the place of his sepulture in full episcopal vestments.

Jewel's testimony furnishes certain useful data. He may appear to imply that none of the 'bishops' (he does not say the archbishop) had been consecrated before November 15, 1559; he had no apparent knowledge of the Lambeth Register, to which he could not refer Harding (who asked for some such official record); he neither

¹ Cons. 17/6/37 by Abp. Lee, and d. 1571. ² Alias Sylvester, cons. 29/12/38, d. 2/5/77.

³ Cistercian of Stanley in dioc. Sarum, Abbot. Cons. 4/11/37 at Lambeth.

⁴ Cons. 23/3/39. ⁵ Prior of St. Mary's, Butley. Cons. March 7, 1527, H. VIII.

⁶ There had been a John Thornton, Prior of Dover, suffragan thereof in Warham's day. Richard Thornden, of Mary's day, is described by Foxe as 'a great persecutor.'

⁷ He is often confused with William Salisbury, the translator of the Welsh Bible.

affirmed nor denied the suggestions concerning Kitchen, and he seems quite ignorant of the part alleged to have been played by Barlow in the consecration: but he does refer with much and intentional significance to surviving members of the older episcopate, among whom only Kitchen, Barlow, Salisbury, and John of Dover have ever been mentioned in this connection by other controversialists, Anglican or Roman.

Jewel's views became increasingly High Church with the progress of the controversy. He terms himself a priest, tries even to find a sense in which the term 'sacrificing priest' can be used—disingenuously. He protests to Parker against the action of the Bishop-Elect of Armagh in ordaining, without power to effect that 'holy service'.¹

The unwilling justification, beneath cross-examination, of a position difficult to defend, leaves Jewel apparently uneasy, with perhaps that vague sense of guilt that will impress a man who has been subjected to prolonged nagging. Without judging the justice of the cause, Harding had nagged him, often bitterly and effectively, and Jewel was driven to protest at the severity of the attack.

The next witness to be considered is Nicholas Sanders. Every attempt to detract from the value of the historical statements of Sanders has proved futile. His reputation for accuracy has increased steadily, as the account of him in the *Dictionary of National Biography* rightly adjudges. From that *Dictionary*, the source of his English information is omitted.

Whatever other source of information he possessed, the letters of his sister, Elizabeth, the wife of Henry Pitts of Alton, in Hampshire, must not be disregarded. These letters were requisitioned by Sir Francis Englefield from the Father Confessor of Sion at Rouen, in 1590. He wanted only copies of the letters, but the originals appear to have disappeared.²

Elizabeth Sanders lived, unmolested, at Alton, until the time of the arrival of Campion in England. Both she and her son, William, were involved in much trouble, owing to their activities in dispersing Catholic propaganda at that time.³ Her subsequent somewhat lenient treatment provoked remonstrance from Cowper, that Bishop of Winchester⁴ so cruelly ridiculed by Martin Marprelate. From various wills, it would appear that the Pitts lived on excellent

¹ *Parker Society, Jewel*, iv, p. 1274. ² *D.S.P. Addenda*, Madrid, Jan. 24 to Feb. 3, 1590.

³ *ibid.*, 1581, Feb., vol. cxlvii, no. 74.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1585, vol. clxxxv, no. 17.

terms with the vicar of the parish, Mr. Barlow, who is a legatee in the dispositions of several of them.

Whatever the source of his information, Nicholas Sanders was early an acknowledged authority. At about the time of the consecration of Parker, on November 10, 1559, Sanders' name had been mentioned as one fit for the cardinalate, endued with which dignity and office, he could more readily present the condition of English affairs to the Holy See. This function, without the dignity, he performed for many years, esteeming Cardinal Moroni, his special friend, the most proper medium of his reports.

The report that Sanders made to Cardinal Moroni, in the course of his duty, is evidence, receivable not only on that account, by Catholics. By Protestants, it may legitimately be put forward as recorded contrary to interest, since it makes for Anglican Orders, in their source, a case far stronger than has been alleged by any other contemporaneous writer. The bias against Kitchen is as strong as in the writings of Harding, and may be regarded as irrelevant to the matter at issue, which is simply whether Kitchen did or did not consecrate Parker.

The first passage, relative to the consecration, occurs in a most interesting and amusing account of 'The Bishops and Clergy of the Catholic Church in England,'¹ (1558-1561): de Johanne White, Wintonensis episcopo, narratur, Gloriant quodam nobile quod saltem episcopus Landavensis ad Lutheranorum factionem, transisset, "Quid," inquit, "unicum mente captum in ordine nostro non licet, quin vos eum vindicetis."

The second relevant declaration is: 'landavensis de quo an episcopopus haberi debeat ideo Catholici dubitant, quia reconciliato sub Maria regno solus dicitur confirmationem a sede Apostolica non postulasse, ut mirum iam noti sit si et schismati cedat et pseudoepiscopi extra ecclesiam consecret. Neque tamen sacer ille chorus episcoporum eius defectionem, qui episcopus legitimus nunquam fuit, contaminatur.'²

It will be convenient to comment upon a translation of these two passages, each of which, presumably, became the source of the attitude adopted by the Holy See towards the religious bodies of England, in the early days of Elizabeth. It is unlikely that the report was communicated freely to such as Harding, Stapleton, and Bris-

¹ Vatican Archives, Arm. lxiv, vol. 28, ff. 252-74.

² Vatican Archives, Letter to Cardinal Moroni, Arm. 64, vol. 28, f. 16, *ut supra*. The contemporary sneer of White is based on a contrary opinion.

tow, whose inquiries as to the source of the new hierarchy may be deemed the proceeds of genuine lack of information.

'First, it is told of John White, Bishop of Winchester, who had occasion to note the exultation of a nobleman, who was rejoicing in the transfer of one bishop, at least, him of Llandaff, to the Lutheran faction, that White, said "What! is mental deficiency to be confined to your party? Are we not allowed to have one man of ours, touched in the head, but you must take him for yourselves?"'

No doubt an octogenarian, faced with the fourth great religious revolution of his life, would not show the alacrity of wit that distinguished White, but the comment on Kitchen could scarcely have been meant to indicate that he had not the usage of reason, enough to consecrate; and that alone concerns the historian.

The second passage, which is of 1561 or 1562, still within the lifetime of Anthony Kitchen, still unexcommunicated:

'It is scarcely a matter for wonder that the Bishop of Llandaff whose episcopate should be accounted doubtful on this ground by Catholics, when the kingdom was reconciled in the days of Mary, alone, it is said, did not seek confirmation from the Holy See; is it, I say, now to be esteemed a matter of surprise both that he fell into schism and that he should consecrate false-bishops, outside the Church? It is no reflection upon that holy band of bishops whom he left, since he was never a lawful bishop himself, at all.'

To which remarks of Sanders—now, quite authoritatively overruled, so far as the capacity of a schismatic bishop to confer Orders is concerned—it may be pointed out that Kitchen had been employed by Mary for the express purpose of dealing with pseudo-bishops, Hooper,¹ and others, and that their trial could scarcely have been entrusted to a bishop whose Orders were in any way deemed doubtful. However, the matter is not worth arguing; it has been settled in a fashion adverse to Sanders' contention—one quite legitimately advanced in his period.

What is of importance is the definite statement—that Kitchen consecrated Parker—sent to the proper source at Rome, by the proper agent for inquiry; and that he was the source of Orders of the Anglican bishops.

This positive statement of Sanders, so far from meeting contradiction, or lack of acceptance, at Rome, was permitted to persist, and was Sanders' opinion throughout his lifetime. It is to be found in his account of the acts of his own day, '*de Origine et Progressu Schismatis Anglicani*.'² 'The bishops who had been created out of

¹ At the trial of Hooper, he did not sit, apparently.

² *Op. cit.*, lib. 2, p. 350.

the Church did each of them crave pardon from the see apostolic and confirmation in their bishoprics (in the days of Mary), excepting the Bishop of Llandaff, who omitting it, rather out of negligence than malice, did only relapse into schism in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.'

In the same tenour a report to Moroni:¹ 'The Bishop of Llandaff suffered himself to be seduced by the Queen of England into obeying her and consecrating all those schismatical and heretical bishops whom the Queen appointed of her own authority.'

If by 'all those schismatical bishops,' Sanders means strictly those appointed by the Queen's simple authority, without previous election or confirmation, the phrase could apply to the three named in the Royal Mandate of October 20, 1559,² to whom were committed certain acts of jurisdiction appertaining to their occupancy of their sees. These were Parker, Grindal, and Coxe, and Sanders does apparently affirm these to have been consecrated by Kitchen. He may be correct. No mandate for the consecration of Grindal or of Coxe follows the alleged date of Parker's own consecration.

Here, then, are two groups of contemporaneous evidence; Jewel's and Sanders'. Both came under the scrutiny and criticism of Parker. To Jewel's *Apology*, Parker wrote, so it is confidently alleged, the prefatory account of the Church of England. He scrutinized the work of Sanders for references therein to the matter of the marriage of Anne Boleyn.³ He selected and employed writers to confute Sanders' books. From both Jewel and Sanders he must have been aware of the common repute that Kitchen was the fount of the Orders of the Anglican hierarchy.

This source he was compelled to consider in the course of the reunion proposals of the earlier Elizabethan years. He was to discuss the matter with De Quadra first, then with his successor. Finally, he avoided the like discussion with the Bishop of Coutances.⁴

What could be the reason for Parker's careful reticence concerning the source of Anglican Orders, if that source were indubitable?

From 1558 onwards, Parker was suspect, as a 'great Papist'⁵ and harbourer of Papists, by the reforming party that constituted a large and vocal minority of Protestantism in the country. By the Queen,

¹ Unsigned report; date, 1562. Vatican Archives, Arm. lxiv, vol. 28, f. 167.

² Commission, Letters Patent of that date.

³ Parker to Burleigh, December 25, 1572. The impudent forgery intended would have a draft actually extant. Parker was to be the dupe.

⁴ *Parker Society, Parker*, p. 215.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 479.

Parker was held in occasional disfavour, on account of his marriage (which was, of course, not sanctioned by law) and on account of his remonstrances with her on the retention of the crucifix in her private chapel. If the reforming faction, that gave so much trouble to the Government and to Parker, had been aware of the consecration by Kitchen, the very rift in religion, which Parker and Cecil postponed, would have occurred, and that, at a time when the danger of the regnal succession, and Elizabeth's precarious title, demanded national unity.

Had Parker been consecrated by Barlow and the bishops named in the Lambeth Register, and had that consecration, insufficient to pass on what Fulke terms the 'dirty, greasy Orders of Rome, which he spat upon,' been openly avowed, the Puritan party could have been satisfied with its guarantee of an eternal separation from Rome, and even from aught more than an administrative superintendence, to which no sanction of divine transmission of power could be attributed.¹

Cecil and Parker chose the course that appeared to secure all likely benefits—the possibility of a valid episcopate, whilst the chance of reunion persisted, and, when that had failed, resumption of an ordinal that left no possible ground of objection to be discovered by respectable Protestants.

Froude, who so often fails to understand a theological position, describes the Elizabethan bishops, as a State stud of aged gentlemen of undoubted breeding, preserved by Elizabeth for the mysterious purposes of spiritual propagation. How far he was incorrect, the reader may judge from the contents of this and preceding chapters.

It would be strange, indeed, if evidence of the consecration of Archbishop Parker by Anthony Kitchen, could not be supported by passages from the Lambeth Register, if that register were, as has been continually surmised, compiled from documents in large part genuine; false, as to the remainder, chiefly in the account of the events of December 17, 1559, and of events that are adduced in corroboration of that account.

If such errors are found, and can be shown to be consistent with a consecration by Kitchen of Parker, and, perhaps, of Grindal and Coxe, then the intent of the proofs already set forth is further confirmed.

¹ But even Fulke, rejoicing in the bareness of the new Anglican Ordinal of later Elizabethan days, wrote thus in reply to Stapleton, 'Where he saith that all the popish bishops were deposed there was none to lay hands on the bishops that should be newly consecrated, it is utterly false, for there was one of the popish bishops that continued in his place' (*Fulke's Answer, Parker Society*, p. 118).

Let us take an example. At the confirmation of December 9th, when the 'Citation to Opposers' was read, Barlow, according to the register, declared that the Queen's Letters Patent were sealed with the Great Seal of England (which was legally moved, at that time, by the Privy Seal).

Now there are two documents, Letters Patent; one of September 9, 1559, addressed to Tunstall, Bourne, Poole, and Kitchen, attested by Elizabeth, and apt the Privy Seal; a document, authentic and regular. The second, which includes the names of Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, *Richard* [*sic*] Hodgkins, Salisbury, and Bale is alleged to be of December 6, 1559, and is without seal, or authentication, of any sort that would attach to a sealed document.

Barlow, therefore, is represented by the register, as referring to the September authority to Tunstall, Kitchen, and the others to consecrate. The truth concerning the consecration, prior to the confirmation, slipped out—because the documents were before the confirming bishops at the time.

Next, if Coxe and Grindal were, in fact, consecrated with Parker in October, 1559, it would be necessary, for the writer of the Lambeth Register to represent them as consecrated later, at a date after December 17th. This would involve such sufficient miscopying as would allow chances of detection to arise. They do arise.

The Lambeth Register, on folios 18, 22, 32, and 39 respectively, affirms that Grindal, Coxe, Meyrick, and Sandys were consecrated on December 21, 1559, by Parker. If so, Cecil and the Queen were taken by surprise, for a writ to consecrate Coxe is recorded as issuing seven days later, December 28, 1559.

Meyrick's consecration is a puzzle. The Parker Society Series had two accounts of the matter, and reprinted an amended edition of one volume that was detrimental to 'orthodox' belief in the accounts of the consecrations.

Bullingham's election and consecration presents even stranger features. Of the date of election of every other bishop of the Church of England, appointed in the first two years of Elizabeth, the Lambeth Register makes record. Of the election of Nicholas Bullingham to be Bishop of Lincoln, it does not. The compiler was ignorant of the date, obviously. Hence in the records relative to the alleged consecration of Parker on December 17th, Bullingham is styled Archdeacon of Lincoln; whereas he was at that date bishop-elect. No contemporary scribe could have made the error,

or could have induced Bullingham to describe himself as archdeacon, a position he did not occupy upon the date in question. The licence to elect him Bishop of Lincoln is dated November 25, 1559, and he was not granted the archdeaconry *in commendam* until January 18, 1560, and is styled in the grant, under Privy Seal, 'Bishop-Elect of Lincoln.' Probably Parker's friends lost touch with Bullingham, for, shortly afterwards, Parker recommends to Cecil, by letter of August 11, 1561, that a lady associate of the bishop should be whipped at Bridewell, and his Lordship of Lincoln soundly chidden for his sportive indiscretions.

Here then again are facts consistent with a consecration by Kitchen on October 29th, and inconsistent with a consecration on December 17th. For on October 29th, Bullingham would not properly be described as Bishop-Elect of Lincoln, on December 17th he should have been so described. The proctors of Parker were his two chaplains: Edward Leeds and Andrew Peerson. In the document appointing Peerson, there is a blank for his name. Why? Did not the scribe know? Parker must have known his own domestic chaplain. On October 29th, Matthew Parker knew Leeds well, as his correspondence shows, and did not know Peerson well, and the omission of his name may have arisen from lack of knowledge of the Christian name. On December 17th and in the early months of 1560, his presence with Parker is recorded. The document of the appointment of chaplains has, moreover, the mark of date, sufficiently, for it describes the manor of Lambeth, as being within the Diocese of Winchester. After the restoration of the temporalities to Parker that description could not be, by any stretch of statement, however inaccurate, such as the archbishop could have made. In letters of State, Lambeth Palace, in which Tunstall died, is referred to as Parker's 'house,' prior to October 29th. The whole internal evidence of the appointment of the chaplains points to a date earlier than this October 29th.

Leeds was later Master of Clare Hall; Peerson a worthy writer, responsible for the English of the Book of Job. He was the chosen proctor of the clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff in the Convocation of 1562, and withstood the reduction of rites and ceremonies.

Peerson, who lived in 1594, and who must have witnessed Parker's consecration, may well have left, in his letters, much that could decisively establish the date of Parker's consecration.

CHAPTER V

THE ATTEMPTS AT REUNION, AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

THE recountal of the attempts at Reunion, from the time of the restoration of the Supremacy to the Crown, in 1559, to the epoch of National Protestantism, has never been told in separate form such as could indicate those elements, that rendered the negotiations possible, and those, that doomed the efforts to certain failure. The student must grope amidst doubtful tales and ill-informed opinions, contemporary and second-hand, for hints that will piece him a narrative.

A vast store of informative material exists in Spanish archives. This material is accessible, in large part, for British students, amongst 112 volumes, edited for the Spanish Government by Fernandez de Navarette, Archbishop of San Domingo, and others, in the latter years of the last century, under the title, *Colecion de documentos ineditos para la Historia de Espana por el Marquis de la Fuensanta del Valle D. Jose Sancho Rayon y D. Francisco Zabalburu*, etc. Of these 112 volumes, numbers 87 and 89 and 92 bear the sub-title 'Cartas,' and contain the letters of Alvares de Quadra, and of Guzman de Silva, his successor, as Ambassador of Spain.

Alvares de Quadra was, as the 87th volume informs us, a subject of the kingdom of Naples, who became Bishop of Venosa in 1542, and was translated, by the desire of the Emperor, Charles V, to the See of Aquila, which he retained to his death in 1561. In the three years during which he viewed the progress of the Reformation in England, he served not only his master, Philip II, but the cause of the English Catholics, whose position and difficulties he expounded with sympathy and strange tolerance. He was an indefatigable letter-writer, and recorded much that other observers have missed but he was a judge of character, so faulty that he summed Elizabeth as a brainless sensualist, Cecil as an honest bigot, and Kitchen as an avaricious old fool. When to this is added, that he really thought Leicester—of whose deeds he must have heard current rumour—an honest partisan of Reunion, willing to sacrifice much for that cause,

and when it is found that he trusted Leicester, and his sister, Lady Sidney, to aid him in the project, his limitations become apparent.

His letters, calendared, so far as they appear suitable for English publication, occupy a considerable portion of the State Papers from the documents at Simancas, published by the British Government, under the auspices of the Master of the Rolls. Like all mail-bags from Britain, De Quadra's suffered occasional plundering, so that some of his letters are to be found among the Additional Manuscripts in the British Museum, and not in the collection of the monarch to whom he addressed them. This is notably the case with the letter in which he relates his endeavours to see Kitchen and console him in July, 1559, and to restrain him from the actions that he believed him to be contemplating.¹ This letter most certainly was perused by Cecil. It may have been well for Kitchen that De Quadra added that his efforts to dissuade Kitchen had been in vain.

Froude, for whose great history very copious extracts from the manuscript copies of De Quadra's letters were effected, was too remote from sympathy with the Catholic cause, and the reality of its attachments, to understand De Quadra's efforts at reconciliation, Elizabeth's reluctance to travel the paths of the Reformers, Cecil's wary preparations for possible reaction, and the likely succession of the Scottish Queen to the throne of England, or Leicester's cool calculations relative to the same issue. For Froude, Elizabeth's consideration of these matters were merely 'dangerous traffickings,' prompted by female inconsistency. The safest method of checking Froude's conclusions, relative to Elizabeth, is usually by reference to the opinion of Parker, who not only understood Elizabeth and England, but who had had the inestimable advantage of knowing Anne Boleyn very well indeed. To understand the parents intimately is often to know the worst of which the daughter may be capable. Froude, in general, lacking the point of view that Parker had achieved, arrived at a definite conclusion, that Elizabeth exercised enormous energy and her principal display of consistency, in the creation of a Church in which she thoroughly disbelieved.

In his own forceful phrases, he has thus expressed his thesis: 'With no tinge of the meaner forms of superstition, she clung to practices which exasperated the Reformers . . . her crucifixes and candles, if adopted partly from a politic motive of conciliation, were, in part also, an expression of that half-belief with which she regarded

¹ Add. MS. 26056a.

the symbols of the faith; and, while ruling the clergy with a rod of iron, and refusing, as sternly as her father, to tolerate their pretensions to independence, she desired to force upon them a special and semi-mysterious character; to dress them up as counterfeits of the Catholic hierarchy, and, half in reverence, half in contempt, compel them to assume the name and character of a priesthood, which both she and they, in their heart of hearts, knew to be an illusion and a dream.'

Froude misjudged the worth that Elizabeth attached to ceremonies; a worth that she understood quite rationally, and for which she was willing to risk a fresh religious upheaval, at the very period of the greatest need for national unity.¹ Her principles were clear, simple, and straightforward. She would not permit any external authority to seek from her the sacrifice of one of her convictions, or of any of her interests, since the indulgence of these were of the very nature of reigning; she had no hesitation in demanding the sacrifice of the principles or interests of others, since they were subject to necessities of State. To such necessities of State, secondarily, and to her whims and sex-impulses, primarily, she was quite capable of sacrificing her own principles upon occasion; differing therein little from the majority of human beings. Such understandable qualities warranted the fervent attachment that she aroused, and retained from her extremely able ministers during the days of her mental and bodily vigour. Cecil was of importance to her mentally; Leicester to her carnality; and Parker to the spiritual residue of the Queen. It would be as unjust to doubt the sincerity of the spiritual esteem she manifested for her mother's old friend, as to deny the depth of the other regards, so openly evinced, and maintained against all protest. Parker and Cecil denounced Leicester, and abhorred the project of his marriage with Elizabeth; Leicester intrigued against Cecil with De Quadra; and Elizabeth managed, in one capacity or the other to be the consistently kindly mistress of all three.

As for ceremonies of the Church, her father, at the time when Kitchen was his Chaplain, had explained his attitude, in a metaphor that may not have been hammered on his anvil: 'The Way of my Journey is not the End of my Journey.' If Froude be correct, Elizabeth's 'half-belief' in the Catholic Faith led her to force an imitation of the ceremonies of the Church upon an imposture

¹ De Quadra, letter of July, 1559, records that immediately after the deposition of the old hierarchy, the Eucharistic vestments were restored in use in the Royal Chapel. Who celebrated?

that she created, and for which she desired the reverence of the English people. The thesis seems psychologically unsound.

That Elizabeth had, at the least, the half-beliefs with which Froude credited her may well be true, and may explain the 'dangerous traffickings' with De Quadra, and his successor, Guzman de Silva. She possibly desired to shape the religious settlement in the form that Keble and his Oxford successors, in part, actually achieved. She certainly never designed the arid scepticism of Hanoverian days, or the preaching anarchy of the Victorian period. But she founded stably, by the deliberate delegation of her authority to the archbishop and spiritual persons. The Church she established had all the potential stability of a gyroscope, and was fitted to adapt itself to any variation of temporal government, likely to occur in her times, or those of her successor.

In those days of the commencement of her rule, no successor, save Mary, Queen of Scots, would have met Elizabeth's approval. In the suppression of the will of Henry VIII (under which the title of Catherine Grey might have been recognized), not only the complicity of Elizabeth, but of Tunstall, Cecil—an unwilling party—and Parker, the actual agent,¹ was involved. The 'religious trafficking' had, always attached, secondary issues; the recognition of Elizabeth's hereditary title by Philip of Spain and the Pope, and the alliance of Mary Stuart with a husband, fitted to be her coadjutor in the peaceful ruling of the English people.

With projects, so easily adaptable to the interests of Spain, and of English Catholicism, De Quadra found himself not merely interested, but in partial sympathy. He sought from Rome permission for the English Catholics to attend services not-sacramental, conducted by the ministers of the changed religious body, and was refused his request. Foiled in this effort at compromise, he was driven to formal proposals for a modification of the religious settlement of 1559 by its authors. Some haste in the proffer of his proposals was due to his fear of Parker seeking an understanding with the French bishops; a project which was certainly in Parker's mind from time to time, and of which De Quadra perceived a likely fomenter in Thirlby, Parker's friend. To Cecil, De Quadra on March 25, 1561, made the offer to discuss the existing religious settlement with the Archbishop; if necessary at Cecil's house. Parker, who like many dull, good men, thoroughly undervalued

¹ Parker's letter to Cecil, November 18, 1559.

the great qualities he possessed—sincerity and truthfulness—returned to Cecil one of the few blunt refusals he ever made to a suggestion from that friend. He had, he said, so long refrained from the study and practice of controversy, that he feared he might appear ‘baby-ished’ in talk. He offered to discuss the matter with De Quadra in writing and to permit the destruction of the written matter, if no satisfactory end were attained.¹

De Quadra, honest, ardent, and arrogant, prepared counter-proposals. The religious settlement of 1559 should be submitted again to a free convocation of the clergy, for approval or disapproval. A Papal Nuncio should receive the fresh proposals, and they should be submitted to the Council then sitting; that of Trent. Cecil replied. He bargained for the presence of Parker and others at a Council, and asserted the valid and canonical orders, of such bishops as would attend; an assertion that De Quadra believed and conveyed as new but credible to his sovereign. Cecil was willing that the Pope should preside at the Council, to be called with the assent of other rulers of European countries, but demanded that, in crediting any Nuncio to Elizabeth, her title, as ‘Defender of the Faith,’ should be included in her style, a diplomatic fashion of obtaining acknowledgement of her hereditary claims to the throne, and thus, indirectly, of her legitimacy. A letter to her, prior to the Nuncio’s mission, was requested.²

With Elizabeth’s consent, these proposals were discussed by a committee, of which the English representatives were Parker, Jewel, and Horne of Winchester. Horne’s Protestant sympathies were known and marked. He was the minority of one that enabled the committee to be representative of all shades of opinion. His obstacle-making provoked from Cecil the harshest reprimands, censures no doubt easier to endure than the contempt of opinion and reference he sustained from his Metropolitan.³ Jewel escaped praise or censure. Parker had a correct opinion of the worth of Jewel, the Bishop of Salisbury, as scholar and controversialist, and, no doubt, found in him an able coadjutor in the discussion with De Quadra.

The latter, hasty and arrogant, as always, placed before Elizabeth

¹ Letter wrongly ascribed to 1563 in *Parker Society, Correspondence*, p. 199.

² The letters interchanged possibly exist. They are not published.

³ *Parker Society, Correspondence*, Letter to Cecil, p. 237, April 7th. ‘If this matter shall be overturned with all these great hopes, I am at a point to be used and abused. . . . And if we be thus backed, there will be fewer Winchester, as be desired. . . . What likelihood there might be of this great expectation.’

an ultimatum. He demanded a categorical reply to his proposals, relative to an unfettered Convocation and the submission of its decisions to a Nuncio. Leicester, whose marriage with the Queen of Scots had been mooted, would, perhaps, have assented, but Elizabeth, who had no desire to be 'Head of the Church,' but who jealously safeguarded all that made her Queen of England, saw danger to herself, in the delay of the Papal letter and coveted title, and betook to the most irritating feminism. She giggled and postponed, and irritated De Quadra to the point of the breakdown of the proposals, as they stood. His unexpected death terminated the possibility of the immediate Reunion which he had sought. That possibility ended in August, 1563.

For the purposes of this thesis, the importance of the negotiations lies in the position assigned to Parker, and tentatively granted by his opponent. Had De Quadra, for one moment, believed or known of such a consecration as that recorded by the Lambeth Register, he would have been bound to have regarded that consecration as indubitably null and void. The form used had been condemned by Rome as invalid and insufficient, as recently as the days of Pole. Parker's own registrars had recorded the Bull. There would have been no grounds possible for De Quadra to have attached any importance to Cecil's assurance that the bishops had been validly and canonically consecrated, unless such consecration had been according to a form to which the terms could have been applied, consonantly with the meaning of speaker and hearer. When had the valid form, then, ceased to be used?

As early as March 25, 1561, De Quadra was aware that the bishops had met at Parker's house, to draw up a Profession of Faith, and he recorded in a letter of that date, Cecil's harshness towards Robert Horne, newly Bishop of Winchester, for his adverse attitude towards projects of Reunion. Some essential differences separated Horne from others of his episcopal brethren. He was, later, owing to his own folly, the object of attack by Bonner, who alleged his willingness to plead, in the King's Bench, that Horne was not duly consecrated as a bishop—and the life of the truculent representative of the older hierarchy was staked on the result.

What were the facts of Horne's consecration, so far as they can now be discovered? Perceval, quoting folio 88 of the Lambeth Register, under date February 16, 1560, supplies, as the names of the consecrators, Parker, Thomas Young, Bishop of St. David's,

Edmund Grindal of London, and Thomas Bentham of Lichfield. The date he furnishes is impossible.¹ John Jewel, writing from Salisbury on November 6, 1560, mentions that Robert Horne 'is to be' Bishop of Winchester, a phrase that does not admit the possibility of a consecration seven months previously.

Next let it be supposed that February, 1560, signifies 1560-1, which it well may. Upon February 16, 1561, Thomas Young was no longer Bishop of St. David's; he had become the Archbishop of York, for which see Parker designed his promotion in May, 1560, and to which see he was translated, January 27, 1560-1. Parker was certainly in London on February 16th. He wrote to Grindal on the preceding day, without any mention of the likelihood of their meeting on the Sunday. However, the letter was an official communication, and, perhaps, did not admit of any accompanying personal reference, or addition.

The Lambeth Register is certainly at fault in naming as a consecrator of Horne a Thomas, Bishop of St. David's, at a time when no such bishop existed, either as elect, consecrated, or even contemplated.

If the difficulties of establishing the facts of the consecration arise from some slovenliness of reference and statement by the Anglican authorities relating the facts, these obstacles are not lessened by the editorial help of the Canterbury and York Society's reprint of Parker's Register. From that it would appear that Anthony Hussey, dead over seven months, appointed a deputy to be present at the legal transactions, preceding the consecration. The slip, in this most scholarly aid to research, arises, no doubt, from desire to condense and summarize.

If so much difficulty appears now, difficulties that a mere reference to the original record might easily remove, what must have been the position of Bonner, guessing in the dark, in the days of the scantiest information?

This much is well-nigh certain; Robert Horne was one of few, who by February, 1561, had been consecrated by the formula of that liturgy of 1549, which Cecil had expressly declared was without Parliamentary sanction. The Convocation of 1562, nevertheless, declared that such consecrations had taken place. It is unnecessary to enter into a discussion of the untenable opinion of Convocation that such acts were 'lawful.' The later acts of Parliament and of

¹ A. P. Perceval, *Apology*, etc.

Elizabeth effectually disposed of any implied claim of Convocation to legislative power in such a matter. All that is necessary to note is the belief of Convocation that such consecrations, possibly by the form already adjudged insufficient by Rome, had taken place. The words are, 'Whosoever are consecrated and ordered according to the Rites of the Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, lately set forth in the time of Edward VI, since the second year of King Edward unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rite, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.'

This declaration renders the position still more obscure. It does not suggest that the Pontifical shall cease to be used. It does profess to refer to the Ordinal of 1549-1553, which was probably intended, but its terms do not include the Chertsey Rite, the manuscript, and unknown, book, used by Cranmer for some consecrations in 1547 and following years.

The Lambeth Register (which often preserves valuable records) is here of much aid. It mentions the transition, from the use of the Pontifical to a 'modern form' and indicates that Horne was consecrated by that 'modern form'—presumably that which did not, until years later, receive the authority of Parliament, and which has never since been vested with authority by any other body, secular or ecclesiastical.

By the ancient form, Guest was apparently consecrated, as might reasonably be surmised, from a consideration of that prelate's words and acts.¹ He was consecrated by Parker, 'adhibitis ceremoniis consuetis, infra manerium suum de Lambeth.'²

On the other hand, Parkhurst, whose poem on the deprivation of Harley had shown a certain mental inability to understand the weight of the objection to the Edwardine form, was consecrated on September 1, 1560, a little more than five months after Guest, by Parker, 'adhibitis ceremoniis de usu moderno ecclesiae Anglicanae adhibendis.'

The last consecration that appears to have been effected with the use of a mutilated Pontifical would be that of Hugh Jones, who was invested with the episcopal insignia. A portion of the record would

¹ Good Friday, 1563, Guest, Almoner to the Queen, preached before her on the text, 'Hoc est Corpus Meum,' reiterating that the bread at the Sacrament 'was the very Body, the very same Body which had been crucified' (Froude, cap. 43).

² The ridiculous mistake, found elsewhere in the Lambeth Register, that places the Archbishop's palace in the Diocese of Winchester, is not repeated in this document.

appear to suggest that he had, previously, acted as bishop-coadjutor to Kitchen,¹ with whom and with Kitchen's 'Papist' Chancellor and Treasurer, Evans, sometime President of the Chapter, Hugh Jones had long lived on terms of amity.² The see formerly selected for the title of the Bishop-Suffragan of Llandaff had been Penarth, and, as Jones is styled 'Archbishop-Elect,' it is not impossible that he had one bishop in his archiepiscopal see. Evans is the most likely of those whose names could suggest themselves as the last coadjutor of the See of Llandaff, if such a coadjutor there were. Parker would be perfectly correct in effecting the consecration of Jones, if he had merely acted as coadjutor. To him there was administered one of those modified Oaths of Supremacy, with which Parker, from time to time, indulged tender consciences.³ As there is no 'modern form' for investing the consecrand with the episcopal insignia, Parker must have used an older rite.

An account of Bishop Hugh Jones, embodying all that is known, to his credit, and discredit, is to be found in *Notes and Queries* for 1939.

Parker's position in these transactions may appear the least explicable for all concerned therein. He had, if former arguments stand, been consecrated, himself, with a rite indubitably ancient, and it was his duty to preserve the canonicity and regularity of which Cecil had boasted. All that can be said in extenuation of his use of an illegal and mutilated form, prior to the legislation that sanctioned such action in 8 Elizabeth, is that he had, with the Convocation of 1563, the friction that he describes to Cecil,⁴ that he may have been responsible for the dating of the Ordinal specified in the declaration of Convocation as 1547-1553, and that he utilized the ambiguity to force on the Protestant element a rite somewhat more satisfactory than the jejune service of 1552. His is the discredit of hesitancy that not merely prevented Reunion in his own day, but that has, ever since, vexed Anglicans with the defence of the validity of the Orders of a succession of bishops, whose continuity with their pre-Reformation predecessors is, perhaps, otherwise capable of

¹ Parker would have ensured that no see should be vacant many years, without the possibility of Confirmation of children.

² Kitchen left Jones his silver spoons, which Jones, in turn, bequeathed to Evans; 2 Pyckering P.C.C.

³ To John Southworth Parker tendered such. When Southworth refused the Oath, Parker recognized his conscientious objection and recommended that he should be permitted to go overseas (Letter ccliii).

⁴ *Parker Society, Correspondence*, Letter 127.

historical verification. Such a verification would afford gratification to many outside the Anglican body. The issues to which the great Papal Bull of His Holiness, Leo XIII, confined itself would no longer be obscured by discussion of the possible contents of undiscovered records; and the desirability of accepting the decisions of Authority, as also the nature and sanction for that Authority, would become the proper agenda of discussion by all such as seek for Reunion.

To leave expressions of kindliness and hope;—Bonner, in 1564, had every reason to believe that the Bishop of Winchester had been consecrated by a rite, invalid and, which was more to the purpose, illegal. The position of the law relative to the Oath of Supremacy had been altered to the effect that the Oath could be tendered to ecclesiastical personages by the archbishops and bishops, and that a second refusal to take the Oath so tendered should be punishable with the penalty of death—that is, the death for treason. From these penalties of treason, however, the forfeiture of goods or money was exempted. One clause also protected Peers of the Realm, and another safeguarded Kitchen. The Act should not apply to any 'Peer, or any Person of Eminent Quality whose allegiance the Queen did not in the least question.' Kitchen was excused attendance at the Parliament, and his proxies were selected, apparently by Her Majesty, who chose the congenial Cheney, a High Churchman whose diocese adjoined Llandaff, Grindal, the Royal favourite, and the Bishop of Peterborough.

Parker, who had no intention of becoming the tool of bloody fanatics, and of securing the removal of the pre-Elizabethan bishops by the gallows and the executioner's knife, wrote to Cecil, and enclosed the draft of a letter that he purposed to send to his ecclesiastical brethren. The letter, which issued about the middle of April, 1563, charged them upon their obedience to exercise the greatest circumspection in tendering the Oath the first time, and not, under any circumstances, to tender it the second time (whereby he who refused should incur danger of death) without written authority from the Archbishop.¹

Robert Horne, who purposed the death of Bonner, tendered him the Oath. Bonner refused it, not on the ground that he objected to the Oath, but on others. Ingenious counsel drew up for him several pleas, amongst them one denying specially that Robert

¹ *Parker Society, Correspondence*, Letter cxxviii. Parker's draft was corrected by Cecil, and the desire for leniency originated with Elizabeth.

Horne was, in law, Bishop of Winchester. The plea received full attention.

In the elegant language of Dyer's Reports:¹ 'de Termino Micheal-mis, 6 & 7 Elizabeth, Edmond Bonner jadis Evesque de London fuit certific in Banco Regis par Doctor Horne levesque de Winton pur un Recusancy de nouvel serement appoint aux persons ecclesiasticals. . . . [Here follow pleas.] . . . Et fuit mult debate inter Justic in camera Domini Catlyne si Bonner poit doner in evidence sur cest issue, scilicet quod ipse non est culpabilis, que le dit Evesque de Winton non fuit Episcopus tempore oblationis Sacramenti. Et resolve per omnes que si le verity et matt soit tyel en fait, il a ceo serra bien resceive de cet issue at le Jury ceo triera.'

The judicial decision, which permitted Bonner's plea to go to a jury, was, perhaps, not warranted. What was triable would be in the end a question of law—'What was the lawful mode of consecrating a bishop in 1561?' Then, for the jury, 'Was Horne consecrated by that form?' But the decision of the judges left Horne in a dilemma worse than the mere trial of this issue could have done. He was left to the proof of a matter of fact, the very fact of his consecration at all, of which the best evidence would have been the production of Parker's Register by Parker, had it attested the use of a legal rite. Horne had disobeyed Parker in a flagrant fashion, and Parker gave no sign of help to Horne in his need. Bonner was left untroubled by any process upon the report of his recusancy. It does not appear that he had the temerity to seek a *nolle prosequi*. Had he done so, the evidence that Horne was not legally Bishop of Winchester, at the time that he presumed to tender the Oath of Supremacy, would have been overwhelming.

If Bonner had no opportunity of stating the matter cogently, he did not lack one who could. Stapleton writes: 'Quis nescit te tuosque collegas non dico aliter quam requirunt Canones Ecclesiae, sed non secundum praescriptum statutorum vestrorum ordinatos esse? Qua ergo fronte, qua facie, nomen Domini Episcopi Wintoniensis tibi arrogare audes, quo leges omnes tam Municipales quam Ecclesiasticae, merito te privant?'²

Had Stapleton been correct in his suggestion (if for 'collegas' we should understand 'omnes collegas'), then every Catholic to whom the Oath was tendered could have availed himself of Bonner's Pleas, or rather of those of the counsel appointed him by the Court

¹ Lincoln's Inn Library.

² *Opera*, tom. 2, pp. 839, 840.

of King's Bench; Plowden, Wray, and Lovelace. These gentlemen would have needed no such lucrative practice from relieving Catholics of an intolerable danger.

All three were men of high legal eminence, and the choice of them, by Elizabeth's advisers, would appear to reflect upon them the utmost credit for an impartiality and generosity towards a fallen foe. Scarcely a spark of such sentiments could have moved them. Elizabeth, who sometimes remembered small matters, had her occasion of obligation towards Bonner, but the motives of the choice of the eminent counsel were not hers, entirely.

Plowden had distinguished himself, during the Marian period, by bold separation from the dominant party. He was a convinced Catholic, and to him the highest positions of the law, in particular that of Chancellor, were offered by Elizabeth. He preferred to remain untitled, the greatest of the lawyers of his time. Some of his favourite utterances have passed into the number of the adages of the English people. One, 'The Case is Altered,' has furnished a puzzle to collectors of rare public-house signs.

Christopher Wray was also a Catholic, lukewarm to the border of indifference, whose concurrence in the opinions of the case of Bonner was followed by his elevation to the post of Speaker of the House of Commons, and later to that of Lord Chief Justice, a capacity in which he tried Edmund Campion, not without humanity and decency of behaviour.

The third of the Serjeants may have been Parker's direct and personal choice. William Lovelace, who was not raised to the degree of Serjeant until Easter, 1567, had accompanied Jewell in the Visitation of the Western Counties, in 1559, one of the lay commissioners and legal advisers. Thereafter, he became one of Parker's Counsel, and, still later, Steward of the Liberties of the Cathedral of Canterbury, and, probably, of the see, in succession to the celebrated Sir Roger Manwood.¹

Thus, a Catholic unswerving, a Pilate, who washed his hands of the blood of the Just, and a convinced young partisan of the new order, concurred in their opinions that the title of the Bishop of Winchester was expugnable, and his episcopate assailable. As their opinions exist, probably, among the vast collections left, it would be imprudent to state generally, what some antiquary may choose

¹ He was recommended by Lord Burghley. See Parker Society, Letter cccix, and Saml. Carte, MS. *penes auctorem*.

to search out and publish with particularity. The effect of their opinions has been recorded already: that Horne was not the legally consecrated Bishop of Winchester.

What were the motives of Elizabeth, of Parker, and of Cecil in procuring for Horne a fall so disastrous? Why were those who procured it rewarded so munificently and so promptly? Against all the 'protestant' leaders, save Grindal,¹ Elizabeth had good reasons for anger. They had, in her opinion, and in that of Parker, disturbed the religious unity of the nation for trifles, and had treated her, and her scruples, with personal offensiveness. The shocking insult to the Host, offered by the Cambridge players, had provoked from her a marked expression of religious feeling, spontaneous and genuine.²

To give to a foremost representative, such as Horne, a Protestant leader who had incurred the resentment of Cecil, of Parker, and of herself, the lesson, that he was dependent upon her mercy for the avoidance of grave penalties may have been an incitement to her acts, as weighty as her real objections to the new Ordinal, and her preference for the Pontifical, the legal form. She refused to sanction the introduction of a Bill into Parliament that would have ratified the Articles of Religion prepared by Convocation, and thus would not only have legalized the use of the new Ordinal, but attached to it the sanction of religion.³

To such a Bill, Elizabeth was ultimately forced by circumstances to assent. The extraordinary wording of the Act, of 8 Elizabeth, finally permitted, had no relation to validity, but, merely, to the legal standing of possessors of episcopal sees and their revenues: 'Both the present Bishops, and all such as should be hereafter consecrated, are to be deemed truly and lawfully such, any former Law, or Canon, to the contrary, notwithstanding.'⁴ As this clause could refer only to unrepealed, 'former,' law, it is obvious that the previously subsisting illegality of the Ordinal of 1552 was assumed, that the accuracy of Bonner's contention was admitted, and that the continued use of the Pontifical remained, and remains to this day, permissible, for the consecrations of bishops in the Church of England. It will be remembered that Rogers, Bancroft's chaplain, asserts that the Pontifical, or to use his words, the rite in use prior to the days of Edward VI, was still an accustomed form in the days

¹ He wore a cope when celebrating, and wavered, when necessary, in those days.

² Froude, vol. vii, cap. 43. ³ Parker Society, Letter ccxv. ⁴ 8 Eliz., cap. 1.

of James I. There is no reason, apart from his assertion, to credit anything of the sort.¹ His assertion is unique, authoritative, and, perhaps, purposeful falsehood—designed to mislead foreign opinion.

The growing Protestantism of the nation, and the apprehension of the succession vesting in Mary of Scotland, both contributed in procuring Elizabeth's assent to this disastrous Act. She had arrived at the very conclusion that Froude deemed her first purpose. She had created a prelacy, facsimile of the older hierarchy, that could never meet the tolerance of the Puritans. Its existence later split the nation, whose unity Elizabeth desired to preserve, and brought her successor to public execution. For her the new hierarchy was a sham and a pretence. She characterized its members as hedge priests.

Parker, who certainly would no more willingly have promoted the Bill than have spoken in its favour, as representative of the hierarchy, was silent, or absent, whilst eleven members of the Upper House, all laymen, and not all Catholics, recorded their solemn protest against it. Wray, who quite understood its permanent effect, was silent in the House of Commons.

From the moment of its passage, the Archbishop never uttered a single protest against the attacks of the Roman Catholic controversialists upon the Orders of the Church of England, and countenanced no defence in others. The nearest approach to defence was his committing the custody of a reply against Sanders to Deering, 'the most learned man in England.' He sent the reply to Cecil with the criticism that it was merely 'childish.'² He regarded himself as the legal holder of the jurisdiction of the See of Canterbury, vested by Her Majesty with the Supreme Government ecclesiastical, and suggested that to placate the Puritans further, the entire matter of settling how bishops should be ordered should be decreed by Her Majesty,³ and that he would retire to the more congenial rank of parish priest, or parish clerk, wherein he could doubtless find opportunities for useful work.⁴ When, in the days of the Bonner matter, asked by the Bishop of Coutances to explain the nature of Anglican Orders, Parker took refuge, as he informed Cecil, in professing a superfluity of diet, such as removed a superfluity of ecclesiastical curiosity.⁵

With the change of days, and the death of his old friend, Thirlby,

¹ Some form of ordination to Minor Orders may have been used in the Diocese of Durham until the late eighteenth century, when the results caused legal inconvenience.

² Letter cccxiii.

³ Letter cccxlviii.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Letter clxiv. M. de Cossé was 'very inquisitive' about the matter. Parker consulted Boxall, Thirlby, and Guest on canon law, as late as 1567.

from whose example Parker had hoped to procure ideals of holy life and Christian end, the spiritual and mental outlook of Parker changed enormously. His physical attributes suffered corresponding alteration. Former accurate and clerk-like letters became slovenly, wandering productions, in which missed words, and obscurity of ideas and expression, bear painful witness to defects of age and infirmity. Once or twice, Cecil rebuked him for loquacity. The Archbishop, aforesaid tolerant and kindly, became intolerant, savage, and sadistic towards those who differed but little from him. Scarcely a courteous or kindly word concerning any man is to be found in sad patches of his days. Concerning the Puritans, he was vulgarly obscene.¹ With the removals of inhibitions, that spiritual life and prayer had once imposed on him, vanity, and clutching for temporal wealth, grew. Towards the end, a celebration of the Holy Communion on the first Sunday in the month,² at his cathedral, satisfied him, who once had lamented the coldness of Protestants in their too short devotions. He wrote to Cecil that he cared for none of the things for which he had once struggled at the Queen's demand.³

When the end came, that clarity of vision, with which the Redeemer will bless those who once have loved Him, may have touched the heart of this woeful prelate. He died, his will asserts, a Catholic bishop. The phrase is not to be found in the testamentary dispositions of his consecrands, Horne and his like, and such weight may attach to it as the writer probably intended.

That Will, at least, cannot be accounted amongst those forgeries of his writing, in official documents, lamented by him, to which the poor old man thought he could hardly have put his name.⁴

The fact of the forgery, during Parker's lifetime, of documents purporting to be his own script, so ingeniously fabricated that the Archbishop doubted whilst disclaiming, is significant. Does it not throw light on contemporary practice, and on the alleged record of Parker's consecration, found, strangely placed, out of all chronological sequence, in the roll of memoranda of personal incidents, heretofore criticized in Chapter II? Let this alleged record of consecration be read with the fact of contemporaneous forgery, extensively practised, in the reader's mind. 'Extensively practised,'

¹ He compares a weighty answer with *fulgar ex pelvi*, Letter cccxxxiii.

² Letter cccxxvii.

³ Letter cxxxviii.

⁴ Letter cccxx.

so extensively that the first Act of Amnesty of the reign of James I was compelled to include the forgers of registers.

The family entries of this part of the Roll include events of date as late as 1570, and from that time any memoranda of family events, in the handwriting, or ostensible handwriting, of Parker ceases. But beneath the last of the entries is the following:

'17 December Anno 1559 consecratus sum in Archiepiscopum Cantuar. Heu, heu Domine Deus, in quae tempora servasti me. Jam veni in profundum aquarum et tempestas demersit me. O Domine vim patior, responde pro me: et spiritu tuo principali confirma me: homo enim sum, et exigui temporis, et minor etc. Da mihi fidium tuarum etc.'

From this point, the remainder of the document is entirely in the hand that Perowne is assured is not that of Parker. It is in no way concerned with the consecration. What connection with the record of that event has this curious collection of dates?

Note 'Anno 1559.' Where else, except in the incredible entry relative to the death of Parker's wife, and of the years that she had 'lived' with him, is the word 'Domini' omitted, in making solemn note of solemn fact?

Note the next words, 'consecratus sum in Archiepiscopum.' Parker's previous form had been 'Subdiaconus factus sum,' 'Diaconus factus sum,' 'Presbyter factus sum.' Why should he alter an excellent style for a worse?

Note the hotch-potch of quotations that follows. Parker was capable of expressing his emotions in excellent Latin, and was not tied to quotation to effect the record of his spiritual charge.

The passages are not even appropriate to the day named. They are not selected from the lessons or from the psalms for the day. Quotation from Parker's own metrical version of the Psalms might have been expected; he resorts to the 'corrupted' versions of the blind and ignorant Papists.

But it is not on any inappropriateness of the jejune mention of the consecration that refusal to accept its alleged testimony must be based. That refusal should be upon grounds that would influence any body of men accustomed to consider evidence. The document fails in accuracy of particulars, specially within Parker's knowledge, again and again. His age, the duration of his marriage, the number of Sundays in Advent, are peculiar matters for the ignorance of an Archbishop who was, at least, a painstaking antiquarian. If upon

such matters the record is inaccurate, and grossly so, why should it be trusted against the official statements of Parker and his own registrars? Assuming that the memoranda were written by Parker, private notes should not weigh against official documents, made by the same man, in the course of his duty, and for public cognizance.

CHAPTER VI

THE DEATH OF KITCHEN AND THE EVENTS THAT BEFELL LLANDAFF

'The voyage of long lives we make, in general, by dead reckoning, having scant time to take our altitude' (R. B. Cunningham Graham).

'Hast thou no home, O brother,
No port in chartless seas?'

(Euripides)

'Life: A slip of Time between a date and a ghost-mark, spatched from the night we are and feel and fade with: the yesterselves we tread and turn upon'
(James Joyce, 'Work in Progress').

'Ferant confestim confusionem suam qui dicunt "Euge, euge" '
(Psalmus xxxix. 16).

'Ego autem mendicus sum, et pauper: Dominus sollicitus est mei' (Ibid., v. 18).

SEC. I

THE SUMMARY OF WHAT FOLLOWS IN SEC. 2 OR IS CONTAINED ELSEWHERE CONCERNING KITCHEN'S LIFE

THE tale to be told of the events in the Diocese of Llandaff, prior and subsequent to the death of Kitchen, would appear utterly incredible, were they not avouched by extant documentary evidence. It would not be incredible that Elizabeth would tolerate a bishop who refused acknowledgement of her Governorship of the Church. There is to such tolerance a close parallel in the dealings with Sebastian Westcott, the Prebendary of St. Paul's, each of whose travails with or excommunications by Grindal, was followed by increases in the royal bounty,¹ always, theretofore sufficient, and generously paid by a Queen whose general parsimony was notorious. It cannot be supposed that Westcott, in any of his visits to her, on the Great Festivals, showed the least abatement of his recusancy. Sanders vouches for his freedom from any schismatic act.² From the days when first, at Hatfield, Westcott delighted her aesthetic tastes, to his death in 1582, this priest retained her peculiar favour, and continued the instruction of the 'Children of St. Paul's,' despite every remonstrance from the Bishop of London.³

¹ Chevalier Grattan-Flood, in *Musical Antiquary*, 1912.

² Vatican Archives, lxiv. 28, ff. 252-74 in *Cath. Record Soc.* vol. i, p. 21.

³ *Parker Society, Remains of Abp. Grindal*, Letter xxiii.

If this could happen, where no great necessity of State demanded the retention of an officer, it becomes less unlikely that Elizabeth and Cecil were cognizant of the acts of Kitchen at Llandaff, and regarded them as convenient for the purposes of the Reunion contemplated in 1561. The toleration of Llandaff practices in later years is simply inexplicable, and as scandalous as the Bishop of Hereford regarded them in the days of Elizabeth's successor.

The earlier career of Kitchen has already been sketched. It will be necessary only to warn the student of Tudor religious history to treat with reservation the entirety of the charges, so frequently brought against Kitchen, in especial with regard to the spoliation of his see. That spoliations were effected in the days of Edward VI, is true, but that they were effected by the usual robbers of the period, Somerset, the Herberts, and the like, is assured. Anthony Kitchen lived and died, so far as extant records indicate, in poverty. Neither can the charge of inconsistency be brought against him with force greater than against any prelate of his day, save Fisher. He had acknowledged the Supremacy of Henry VIII, at the time of the Visitation of the Monasteries, and narrowly escaped the penalties of Treason, for a curious distinction made by him, upon which one charge was founded at this trial. 'To hear the King's words and to yield consent to them were different movements of assent' was the distinction that, in fact, he drew, then and afterwards. From ex-Abbot of the dissolved Monastery of Eynsham, he was suddenly raised to the position of Chaplain to Henry VIII, for no known reason, and occupied the post without complaisance to Cranmer, or marked friendship with Gardiner. To him, in his old age, Henry gave the Bishopric of Llandaff, already plundered by a Royal Visitation, but still one of the richest patronages in the King's gift. In some fashion Kitchen evaded the Oath of the 'Veil Removed,' that had been prepared for him, by Cranmer, at his consecration to Llandaff—Cranmer's Register and its significant blank after the Oath bear witness to the fact that the proceedings remained in draft. Throughout the reign of Edward VI, Kitchen and his see were robbed and defrauded by processes legal or criminal, in anarchic days of lawless pillage. When Mary's days came, Kitchen showed not the slightest inclination towards revenge on his old persecutors—Laodicean lukewarmness that did not prevent the recovery of valuable vestments and chalices from Wm. Herbert.¹ His protection of harassed Protes-

¹ Land Revenue Records, Church Goods, Bundle 1393, File 178.

tants, both in his own diocese and elsewhere, is sufficiently attested. The record in Foxe is the only eulogy therein of a Catholic bishop, as a godly and a Christian man, an opinion volunteered by the one heretic Kitchen reluctantly tried. From the decision in Hooper's case he withdrew, but performed the functions committed to him by Mary's Letters Patent, in declaring the nullity of the Orders of certain Edwardine bishops consecrated according to the new Ordinal, and of depriving them. He did not seek reconciliation with Rome, from Cardinal Pole, absented himself from Parliament, during the reign of Mary, and returned only to protest against the fresh changes of religion of the first year of Elizabeth. To those changes, as existing in July, 1559, he reluctantly assented.

If he had passed through so many religious revolutions, steadily occupying the position asserted by the whole hierarchy from 1535 onwards to 1549, there may be ascribed to him a principle of consistency that established him in a middle course which the remnants of that hierarchy found untenable and impossible in 1559. Doubtless that principle was insular—call it, perhaps, excessive love of England, the like that led Thirlby, Tunstall, Bonner, and, in a measure, Gardiner, so dangerously on the path of the Reformation. Each differed: 'Every Englishman is an island in himself,' said an American author.

There are certain passions, mixed of intellect and sense, that are difficult of comprehension to the inhabitants of the great cities of to-day. For the country-bred man, the love of England is not a love of its liberty, its freedom, its law, or of the greatness of an Empire. England means for such a man, mayhap a peasant, village-minded, the swelling of the rise up which his tugging horses steamed, the hamlet church, a winding lane, home-sickness for the raftered house where he was born.

Dunstan, Anthony Kitchen, had seen the last of the sad days of deaths of kings and ends of noble lines at Bosworth. In the middle England in which he was born, those Wars of the Roses left a haunting memory of sorrow, such as caused every man to desire the unity of England, at almost any cost, rather than that civil war should be again. It was this strong longing for peace that armed England, Catholic and Reforming, against more than one rebellion, such as would have favoured the cause of the older religion. In Dunstan, this conservative hatred of an actual Civil War of Religion was reinforced by his excessive parochialism. His long university career

at Cambridge and at Oxford, his work on the nave of Westminster Abbey, his care of the house at Eynsham, his long seclusion at Llandaff, fostered in him that love of places and of material things that can so nearly be identified with a spiritual apprehension. Cennick, on the margin of the river, could find the image of his Saviour's face, and Cennick's Master could lament over the stones of the temporal Jerusalem, whilst he was building on high that Jerusalem which is the goal of all the saints. Such a passion is, assuredly, not all of this world. It enables the proper joy in God's creation to find its vent in dear and familiar things. These simple considerations do afford a clue to Kitchen's acts.

In his role as the only representative of the old hierarchy left, diocesan and spiritual peer, in England, Kitchen was aided by the fact, notorious and avouched by Bonner, that he had not been excommunicated. His peril from the extreme Reformers, and their possible complaints to Parliament, were diminished by reason of the distance of his diocese from London, and its extreme isolation from contact with other dioceses. It was separated, by language, and by country often impassable, more completely than Armenia is from London at the present day.

His visits to London were infrequent. He was excused from attendance in Parliament in the Session of 1562, although he was apparently in London at the time. Machyn mentions that he did not ride in the Queen's procession. Then, and longer after his death, the Journals of the Lords record his presence in the House. If he attended Convocation, it was only to register dissent from its proceedings, for, alone of the bishops present, he did not subscribe the new Articles of Religion. He had exactly performed the part allotted to him in the consecration of Parker, and had nothing to fear thenceforth from censure or threat of deprivation. Indeed, to him extraordinary favours were shown. Other bishops were inhibited by the Metropolitan from Visitations of their diocese.¹ Parker reported to the Privy Council all that he deemed necessary for the correction of the errors of the clergy,² and to Kitchen alone was entrusted the task of reporting in detail on his diocese to the Council. A courageous report it is, indeed,³ setting forth those who

¹ Reg. Parker I, f. 220B.

² The abstraction of the Acts of the Privy Council from April, 1559 to 1561 (crucial dates) must have been as deliberate as the impudent theft of Kitchen's register, and possibly originated in like desire of concealment of essential facts.

³ Harl. MS., 595, 69d. The report, of 1559, is dated in error as of 1601. The names of the incumbents fix the date.

administered the Sacraments well and regularly,¹ and omitting any mention of the existence of the preaching clergy, upon whose powers of painful exhortation the Protestant party set increasing store. There is no hint that the new Service Book, and the English Communion, had come into general use, although that had possibly been the case in some of the churches of the diocese. In most, the English would have been utterly unintelligible to the hearers, and in others the old Latin Mass was still the only form of Sunday devotion.²

Always as one of his principal officers, he retained William Evans, of whose papistry complaint was made, only when, after Kitchen's death, it was found that the Episcopal Register had disappeared, and that Evans refused to part possession with it. It is missing to this day. Evans took care of it; so, no doubt, did those to whom he left it. In it are recorded the 'Papist delinquencies' of the days of Kitchen and of Jones.³

Indeed, the records of that Register would have made curious reading, and the position of the Bishops of Llandaff quite uncomfortable. Complaints were made by the end of the reign of Elizabeth that half or more of the clergy of the diocese were unordained, which is the more strange since the pious Bishop of Hereford, who made the contemporaneous complaint, also asserted that the Reformation had not apparently affected the diocese. The simple fact is that it had not.

Regard this simple instance. In 1688, not only was the chapel at Llanfair Kilgedyne used exclusively by Roman Catholics, for services conducted by a recusant priest, but the incumbent, the 'Roman Catholic' priest, drew the entire tithes of Llanteilo Creseney, Grosmont, and Skennfreth,⁴ since the Reformation had never, apparently, extended to the parishes. The recusant papers, from which the record is taken, add that hardly a Protestant could be found in the parishes. These parishes were in the gift of the Morgans of Tredegar, the Church of Llandaff, the Crown, and the Cecils respectively, so that both complaint against the patron and efficient criminal proceedings against the tithe recipient would have been alike difficult and dangerous. No doubt, civil remedies existed.

¹ At Llandogo Sir Lewis Adams was not a massing priest. He only christened and buried.

² At Michaeltroty the author was shown a stone altar with reliquary and relics, undisturbed in 1888.

³ Chanc. Proc. Bdle. 55, no. 69.

⁴ Recusant Papers, Monmouth, 1688-1717, quoted in *Cath. Record Soc.* vol. ii, p. 299.

The tithe-payers could, had they wished, refused payment of the tithes, upon the grounds that the incumbent had not been instituted; for, doubtless, by the omission of this formality, he had escaped subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles.¹ Indeed, there is not a single known instance of Kitchen having required the Oath of Supremacy, or subscription to the Articles, from any one of his clergy, and he does not report any instance of such conformity to Cecil and the Council. But he had only promised to demand or accept such oath when law and the settlement of 1559 compelled. Plainly it could not be demanded from presentees, not instituted. He complied strictly with the terms of his bond. At Llanfair Kilgedyne, the anomaly was allowed to persist until the days of penal risks had passed. In the time of Dutch William, it was felt that something must be done. Fortunately, English law recognizes prescriptive rights in incorporeal hereditaments.² Moreover, Roman Catholics had to be buried somewhere, and the churchyard of St. Teilo was regarded as specially theirs for use until 1780, when better provision for Catholic worship had become possible.

SEC. 2

THE DEATH OF KITCHEN, AND THE EVENTS THAT BEFELL
LLANDAFF

Such explanations of the causes of the facts, relative to the Diocese of Llandaff, and such amplifications of the inferences from the facts, as have been elaborated in the last chapter, may be dismissed, in whole or in part, if the reader so desire, as fantastic, absurd, and improbable. But the facts remain, and will then need fresh explanation; they cannot simply be let to rankle in the mind of the reader. They witness to an extraordinary licence accorded to Kitchen, in the administration of his see, or archdiocese, whichever Parker chose upon occasion to term it.

Could such immunity from the ordinary custom—nay, perhaps, from the law itself—have fallen to the lot of one, who had been ordered to consecrate the Archbishop, who had illegally and contumaciously failed to comply with the Royal Mandate, addressed to him, who by flouting that Royal Mandate, without excuse, explanation, or apology, had incurred the penalties of Praemunire, who had openly refused to concur with the remainder of the episco-

¹ Sancta Clara defended them but never subscribed them.

² An argument based on a prescriptive right to receive might arise from the judgement in *Chesterfield v. Harris*, which was concerned with fishing rights in ancient demesne.

pate upon the matter of the Queen's Supremacy, who had refused to subscribe to the new Articles of Religion? Why was not such an ancient and contumacious rebel deprived? Can other answer suggest itself, save that he had performed the very duty for which he had been kept—that he had consecrated Parker?

The facts cannot be met with a pooh-pooh, cannot be admitted, docketed, and hidden away,¹ as the papers of Bishop Forbes were by the Primus;² they are the weighty determinants of the course of history, the history of a great nation, and of a great Christian body, that has preserved, taught, and fought for principles of verity, these last four hundred years.

Why, then, should Kitchen have so acted? What he plainly planned, and failed to achieve, was to preserve a corner of England, with a validly ordained priesthood, ready for reunion with the Catholic Church. Only the spiritual judgement of Authority, and not of historians, could stigmatize that, as the spiritual sin of Lot, who thought to worship God in Segor, and to be the father of unsanctified children, where God had caused the ordinary succession to fail.

These are but poor ashes to pour upon the memory of a human heart, that had so long, in simple piety, loved and cherished the places of his habitation, and therein had spent his years of ill-judged kindness and tolerance for the evil that beset his day. And, alas! there are none to offer a Mass for the repose of this poor old unexcommunicated man, who so nearly achieved the purpose of his lawless dream.

Of the simplicity and peaceful drift of his self-centred piety in these latter days, one legend, of South Wales, may be recorded, with every reservation, as totally incapable of verification. In the days when Protestantism had achieved its work in the Diocese of Gloucester, and when Catholics with difficulty could obtain an occasional Mass, a message reached Kitchen that a small congregation wished the services of a priest, shortly after Easter.³ The old Bishop, accompanied by a chaplain, described as a monk, who may have been one of his old community at Eynsham, crossed the Wye by horse-ferry and entered the road towards a ruined Abbey. The message had been the device of a reforming band, who had acquaintance with Kitchen's aid to Catholic recusants, and who had enticed him to another diocese, wherein his illegal practices would be

¹ Chas. Dickens, 'With Inspr. Giles at Rats' Castle.' ² See *D.N.B.*, Bp. Forbes of Brechin.

³ Probably before April, 1562, when Cheney was consecrated.

doubly wrongful. Towards twilight, he and his chaplain were seized, and the old man was tied up to a tree, and left, somewhat racked with cramp, for the night. At the dawn, they perceived that the weight of his body, for he was a bulky old man, was dragging heavily on the ropes, and they released him in some shame, and offered him bread and beer, which he refused, as he had not yet said his prayers.

They followed the old man's stumbling footsteps, as he groped towards the ruined altar of the Abbey, and perceived that he was well-nigh blind. He began the recitation of the Mass, without book, vestments, or elements, missing no word of the office, whilst the ruffians stood aside, whispering their jeers at the poor old fool. When he had reached the Elevation, and his hands were outstretched to heaven, a lark arose from its nest, and, soaring, lifted up its voice to God. The men drew nearer, and, as the recitation drew to its close, touched his garments that they might lead him safely down the crumbling steps, and he blessed them.

They brought him away, and back to his chaplain, and once more offered him their bread and beer. This he took heartily, and said, 'Not vainly, I came to a new congregation.' Whereon, he departed, singing lustily as he rode homewards to his community, at Monk's Court.¹

Possibly the legend is utterly untrue, or true of some one else, but such legends are invented of men of whom they would be likely. Of his love for his belly, Dr. Albert Peel, the learned Editor of the Congregational Historical Society's publications, has, stored in the inaccessible back of his memory, a contemporaneous rhyme that contrasts the Bishop's love of the kitchen with his love for the Church, and suggests that the latter suffered by devotion to the former. It will be recalled that De Quadra alluded to Kitchen as a 'greedy old man,' and the accusation may have had some foundation in fact.²

¹ At Matherne.

² The first use, and growth of the consumption, of beer, in England, had been contemporaneous with the lifetime of Kitchen. Hops had been introduced from Artois, and, by 1464, the price of the best beer brewed from good material with hops was twopence a gallon, whereas the small ale fetched no more than a farthing.

Ale had long been used in the Abbays, and, indeed, in the absence of all our modern beverages, then unobtainable, the use was one nearly of necessity. At the Abbot's table was placed a large bowl, the *Poculum Caritatis*, and this bowl would, doubtless, contain the newer 'beer,' rather than the older ale. Less honoured guests drank the cheaper ale; of which practice the phrase 'to think small beer' of any one preserves the memory. By the year of Kitchen's death, bitter beer had risen to threepence a gallon. It may be remarked that the

In the whole course of his episcopal career, Kitchen was ably abetted by William Evans, a Bachelor of Laws,¹ sometime incumbent of St. Tathan's, alias Tatha, alias St. Athanasius, a minute place in the Deanery of Cowbridge, Glamorgan, so insignificant that it fails to appear in the gazetteers.

Possibly everything connected with the Rev. William Evans may have extraordinary interest, hereafter; and thus the location of Tatha's should, therefore, be established with clarity.

It lies twelve and a half miles on the road towards Neath, from Cardiff. Take the first turning on the right thereabouts, and keep on four miles, until a country, bare of trees and of forbidding aspect, is reached. That is Tatha's. If the reader be an ardent antiquarian, do not let him jump to the conclusion that Kitchen's Episcopal Register lies within the parish chest. It is well-preserved somewhere, and William Evans preserved it, and, as his adversaries declared, in his lifetime, the contents really needed preserving—out of sight. Anyhow, a walk to the village will not disappoint any one who can talk with the few ancients, and collect tales of Bryn ap Llyr; just as that keen and worthy intiquary, Archbishop Parker, may have done nigh upon four centuries ago.

There in 1546, in the years when Kitchen had first succeeded to the episcopate, and to the command of a ruffianly band, who had aided his predecessor, Holgate, alike ruffian and embezzling thief, in sacrilegious destruction and pillage, William Evans was a worthy parish priest, somewhat of an intransigent Papist, with an utter dislike to the marriage of the secular clergy. Herein he found himself at one with his Bishop, who, generally tolerant, regarded such marriages with deeper disapproval than that he accorded to the Pensionary Concubinage, traditional in South Wales.² It is to be said to the credit of William Evans, and of his Bishop, that no smirch of scandal has ever been whispered concerning their private lives, whether in respect of occasional or regularized concubinage.

The newly-installed Bishop had, indeed, remonstrated with his Chancellor, one John Smith, Ll.D., on his easy acquiescence in adulteries, both of the clergy and of the laity. Smith had administered his

drinkers of bitter beer, at the period of the Reformation, generally inclined to Calvinism, the ale-drinkers to Lutheranism, and the wine-drinking nations to Catholicism. No inference can be drawn from these data.

At a later period, the early, and Arminian, Methodists drank small ale; the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion otherwise. As Calvinists, they drank bitter beer.

¹ i.e. of Canon and Secular Law.

² Elizabeth, who loathed married clergy, termed it the Splendid Shame of Concubinage.

office in the days of Holgate, and had looted with gusto in the turbulent days of the repression of 'Superstition.' In all things relative to his personal profit, he was of indubitable vigour, and initiative; as burglar, forger, and truculent bully, with an utter disdain for truth, he was particularly fitted for high ecclesiastical promotion, in the ferment of those days. He treated the remonstrance of his Bishop with contempt.

Smith had, unwittingly, touched upon one of the points whereon Anthony would not compromise, and on which he could be roused to the haste of anger—and of language—of which 'The Fool of Oxford' had once complained to Cromwell. Anthony made short work of Smith, and deposed him without the King's authority.

Had Henry VIII not died so inopportunately, he might have had the satisfaction of a grim jest, in the approval of his chaplain's repression of adultery. He had condoned so much for Kitchen theretofore; why, no extant record shows. It may be guessed that the immunity arose from Kitchen's action with regard to a disclosure relative to Anne Boleyn, that nearly had publicity after her death. Recall again that Kitchen had been tried for Treason, and acquitted, by a Tudor tribunal, one of two abbots who so escaped. Kitchen had sheltered Northern rebels; he had shown the Grey Friars of Oxford how to deal with their property in the days of suppression; he had thwarted Cranmer, and aided Serle, Cranmer's embittered enemy; and the only mark of royal observation of these feats had been the gift of a pension nearly equivalent to the emoluments of an abbacy, the distinction of selection as a royal chaplain, and the promotion to the See of Llandaff.

Upon appointment, Kitchen had obtained permission for absence from London, and other duties, and journeyed to his see, where he was resident at the time of the death of Henry. The new Somerset régime lost little time in getting to work. And to plunder, which Kitchen bore, without complaint, so long as he was left undisturbed in his peculiar disregard of Law and the Reformation,¹ which, thence onward, he ignored, as, indeed, he ignored later the fact of the Marian changes. The bishops were required, as has been briefly recounted previously, to take out from the new King, Commissions under Letters Patent, enabling them to draw their jurisdiction to exercise their spiritual office, from the King.

¹ Possibly Somerset, who was not unreasonable, would have recognized that when robbing a man, it would be improper to object to his saying his prayers, in his own fashion.

Their old Courts became the King's Courts, their seals were replaced by the Royal Arms. They were not required to ordain, or to admit to livings in the King's name, but some bishops, such as Barlow, openly regarded this concession as immaterial.

The course of such men as Gardiner, who had never feared to resist Henry VIII, and to 'square up' to his violence,¹ to use the bishop's own words, was clear. Gardiner went to prison, and Bonner followed him, less disdainful of Gardiner's swelling veins and abuse than in the days of Bonner's Reformation tendencies. The method in which each dealt with the difficulty was determined by his physical characteristics, and manifested itself in manner and speech. So did Kitchen's evasion of the problem. With him temporizing and endurance were, not spiritual virtues, but part of his mental make-up, to which his limitations of intellect added a certain simplicity that rendered neglect of change, rational. He simply did nothing, and continued doing it, with such energy and persistence as the process required.

Kitchen found in the extraordinary Act that transferred the spiritual jurisdiction to the Crown, a loophole. All exercise of his powers as Bishop, in a Bishop's Court, was no doubt nugatory, but such exercise exposed the Bishop to no immediate criminal penalty. The Court of Star Chamber could, no doubt, find a remedy against him,² but, would it? He tested, successfully.

He appointed Evans to exercise the functions from which he had removed Smith. Evans joined Kitchen in ignoring the Act.

At Tatha's, Robert Davies, a person of some secular standing, had abducted the daughter of Christopher Basset, a gentleman attached to the reforming interest, and capable, therefore, of exercising influence in the consideration of the Star Chamber proceedings likely to follow. Evans, by direction, excommunicated Davies at the Church of St. Giles, Gileston.³ On Palm Sunday, he warned Davies that he would not communicate him at Easter, unless he made his confession duly. At Easter, Evans refused him Communion, and a brawl followed.

Robert Davies complained to the Court of Star Chamber,⁴ and put his case high, 'that Anthony, Bishop of Llandaff that now is,

¹ The 'squaring-up' was physical. Henry had habitually cuffed Thomas Cromwell, in moments of annoyance. Gardiner was hotter tempered.

² For a Common Law misdemeanour.

³ Thus according jurisdiction, other than parochial.

⁴ Star Chamber Proceedings, Edward VI, Bundle 30, Glamorgan, incorrectly assigned to 1546, instead of 1547.

having no jurisdiction nor authority himself of the King's Majesty, but therein very temerariouſly uſurping upon His Grace's prerogative, Royal, granted a Commiſſion to the ſaid Evans to cauſe Davies to appear at Newcaſtle.¹

Davies had made an error in pleading. The King's powers, that had replaced the episcopal, were ſtatutory, and not prerogative. This it was, probably, that enabled Kitchen, in the end, to obtain the removal of the ſuit from the Star Chamber. Evans, a lawyer, of quite ſufficient ſubtlety, preferred to recount the facts to the diſcredit of Davies. He replied that about three weeks before Candlemas laſt paſt (February 2, 1546-7) he did declare in his Church of St. Tathana Citation delivered unto him by Robert ap Howell ap Richard, apparitor to the Biſhop, put forth by Dr. Smith, then Chancellor to the Biſhop, and that Smith was, the week following, diſcharged of the Chancellorſhip, and that Evans was authorized, in place of Smith as Commiſſary, to the ſaid Biſhop, and that, upon the death of His late Maſteſty, Henry VIII, he Evans proceeded to inquire into the known adulteries and divorces, tolerated by the ſaid Smith.

He probably relied upon the fact that Davies was unaware of the date of the death of Henry VIII, January 28th, and by careful avoidance of admissions, procured an entire legal confuſion of his adverſary.

Some of the pleadings are triumphs of diſingenuousneſs. He diſregarded the fact that his Commiſſion had become illegal under the new Act, and by drawing attention to the date of the death of Henry VIII, and of his own appointment immediately after the removal of Smith, evaded the awkward poſition ſucceſſfully. He neither denied that Kitchen had Commiſſion from Edward VI, nor affirmed it, he ſidetracked the main matter, and attacked the plaintiff's character. He did not deal with the fact that he had held 'illegal Chapter Courts' at Neath and Cardiff, and that the Sheriff had ſeized his books at the latter town. Davies was worſted.

It was at this time that the moſt diſgraceful plundering of the See of Llandaff occurred; conducted by local robbers, and by Somereſet, the Protector of the realm. Somereſet took the Biſhop's houſe, in Weſtmiſter; the Herberts concentrated on the Cathedral. William Matthewes managed to obtain poſſeſſion of much of value that could be demised from the Manor of Llandaff, and James

¹ Star Chamber Proceedings, Bundle 6, no. 34, Glamorgan, incorrectly calendared as of 1546.

Button, the secretary of the Bishop, is not above suspicion of collaboration with Dr. Smith in the forgeries mentioned previously and hereafter, by which the see suffered greatly subsequently to the death of Anthony. No doubt, the Bishop could have resisted by constant appeals to the Courts. But, these Courts were scarcely Courts of Justice at all during the Edwardine religious revolution. He did more wisely by saying nothing, and turning the plundering to the only good account possible.

Thus, throughout this period, we find on legal record that in the Cathedral, one Low Mass a day was maintained, at a time when a Mass was illegal. How was it managed?¹ Quite simply; English cantors should have been appointed, who could have rendered the new English Service after the Prayer Book mode. Kitchen regretted that no funds existed to pay them, and unpaid they were during the whole of the reign of Edward VI.²

In the very last year of that reign, action was to have been taken that would have put an end to Popery. The chalices and vestments were to have been removed, books surrendered. Singularly, the triumphant Reformers seem to have entertained some doubt whether the operation could be conducted without endangering the peace of the realm. It was to be conducted by reasoning and argument, if possible, and the local reactionaries were to be cozened out of their religion. Only if all easy methods failed was force to be employed.

With the accession of Mary, the financial difficulties of the See of Llandaff, and the worries of Kitchen and Evans, could not have been materially diminished. The Commissioners for the Sale of Church Goods were, it is true, halted in their proceedings. Sir William Herbert acknowledged the possession of seven chalices with patens, a saucer of silver, floated with brass, a pax of silver, with a crystal stone therein, a ship of silver, a bell of silver gilt, and a chasuble of tinsel. John Broxholme had the shrine of St. Teilo, and three saints with mitres double gilt. Dr. Smyth, who styled himself Archdeacon of Llandaff, and Treasurer, had all the rest of the stuff, jewels, and plate of the Cathedral, not as Treasurer, but in his capacity of spoliator. Sir John Griffiths, usually his coadjutor in larceny, also claimed the title of Treasurer.³

¹ L.R.R., Bundle 1393, f. *circ.* 180.

² It is possible that funds were available for four.

³ Land Revenue Records, Bundle 1393, f. 178. These indications of the records were first publicly stated by three magnificent volumes; *Cardiff Records*, wherein the student may find much not here the matter of comment.

It might appear difficult to believe that these impudent thieves would have had the temerity to declare in the early Marian days that they were holding the goods to the use of the Cathedral, but this they did. Dr. Smyth has, fortunately, furnished us with his own account of how he acquired control. He broke the Chapter box, during the Bishop's absence, removed the diocesan seal, and, with it, effected presentations to various livings in the patronage of the Dean and Chapter, and allowed the unsuspecting purchasers, who had obtained advowsons from him, presumably by Simony, to seek what remedy they could from the unsympathetic authorities of the Marian era. He did not allow his old skill to lose its cunning, in later days, for, fortified by a pardon from Elizabeth for all his felonies, he produced a Deed, which he alleged to be that of Anthony Kitchen, appointing Smyth of Landaphe, clerk, doctor in laws, William Geffrie of London, clerk, and James Button of Worleton, gent., to be Surveyors and Auditors General of lands, parsonages, and churches, with all and every other spiritual promotion whatever, to them and the longer liver of them.

James Button, a curiously treacherous character, and the Bishop's Secretary, was, possibly, the actual forger of this document, designed for use after Kitchen's death. Button's own will of August, 1558, was not proved until 1600, a delay probably caused by the trouble in which controversy, arising from advowsons and presentations, obtained under his spurious authority, involved him.

William Geffrie does not appear to have been as fortunate as his coadjutors, in escaping the hands of the Law. In the first days of Elizabeth he was clapped in prison, where he remained nigh a year and a half, with one John Moore, who claimed that he was Christ. Smyth does not seem to have appended the seal of the Dean and Chapter to this gift of spirituality. Griffiths, who had been associated with Moore, as his disciple, and who may have been either dupe, or, as is more likely, exploiter, was whipped at Bethlehem, in Bishops-gate, on April 10, 1560, and cured of his delusion.¹

To have wrought drastic vengeance upon the spoliators, and the crew of Smyth, Griffiths, and the like, would have been easy for Kitchen in the Marian days. He and Evans adopted towards old adversaries a policy of immediate reconciliation and of moderation,

¹ *Rogers, Parker Society*, p. 162. Rogers omits the funniest of all the claimants to the title of Messiah: 'Cujus,' who asserted his immortality, since he was the veritable 'Cujus' of the Nicene Creed, 'Cujus regni non erit finis.' No remnant of the Cujite Sect survives, even in the United States.

not without success. They were surrounded with clergy, in total accord with their Bishop. Through his long episcopate, there is not a single complaint, by one cleric of the diocese, recorded against the administration of Kitchen and his able Chancellor, nor, curiously, any rancorous reference to doctrinal differences. In the turmoil and controversy of that time, Llandaff kept itself free from bitterness, and, save in one instance, where the work was that of the Sheriff of the County, from persecution.¹ Outside the diocese, Kitchen held himself aloof from the violence of the Marian re-action. He pronounced against the Orders of Edwardine bishops, it is true, called to that duty by Royal Mandate, but, as will be recalled, he declined to serve upon the tribunal that sent Hooper to his death, although the like Royal command had vested him with the function. In his opposition to persecution, he was associated always with his old friend, Holyman, the saintly Bishop of Bristol.

Kitchen was already failing in vigour and intellect, when the crucial period of his days arrived, with the accession of Elizabeth. He threw what of energy was left into a spirited resistance to change, conducted in his constitutional place in the Lords. In much of that resistance he had, without any manner of doubt, the sympathy of Elizabeth. The events of the following three years have already received treatment.

Towards the close of the year 1563, the health of Kitchen showed marked signs of failing. His sight and memory were alike impaired; indeed, his sight for four years had not enabled him to read a service-book. It is little likely that he had a power of committing to memory the phrases of the new Elizabethan liturgy, and his daily Mass, to which Bramhall refers, was probably of his more ancient recollection. Of his last days, it is recounted that he had ridden to London, probably for Convocation, or Parliament,² left there a lease for which he sent back, that his house at Westminster³ was searched in vain, and that, on his death-bed, he sought to recall its terms and to establish the title of the true lessee.⁴

By August, 1563, Kitchen was beyond the exercise of his episcopal

¹ *D.N.B.*, often misleading in its account of Kitchen, is so upon this matter.

² The Prayer for the opening of Convocation, still retained, must have been offensive to him, and embarrassing to Elizabeth and Cecil.

³ Not that one looted by the Duke of Somerset. Some public-house with the Mitre sign may yet indicate the place. The sign marks the neighbourhood of Thirlby's and of Oglethorpe's old residences.

⁴ *Chan. Proc. Eliz.*, Bundle 127, no. 65. *Henry Mathew of Bernard Inn v. Dean and Chapter of Llandaff.*

powers, and the administration of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, in such cases as demanded correction, had fallen to Evans. One particular instance throws a flood of light on the practices of Parker with relation to the old Papist party. From the year 1543, a certain priest, William Dawkins, had troubled the diocese. In that year, Richard Harry, of Canton in Llandaff, had died, and had desired that his body should be taken into the cathedral, and that there, during the time of Divine Service, prayers should be said for the repose of his soul. Thomas Mathew, William Dawkins, and others stole the corpse from the cathedral, apparently to promote Reformed doctrine. By July, 1562, Dawkins was parson of Llan-sannour, alias Thawe. 'Dawkins' was a term of Elizabethan argot for 'sloven.' Dawkins lived up to the name, neglected his parish, and was duly sequestered on July 6, 1562. He showed commendable energy, betook to Canterbury, put his cause before Parker, alleged apparent good reasons for absence from his parish—absence which had extended over a year—and was restored to his spiritual cure by the end of August.¹

Evans made fresh complaint the following year, and a new sequestration issued, dated August 11, 1563; a sequestration that removed Dawkins from troubling the diocese for the next seven years. It is the form and peculiarities of this document that demand attention. It is to be found on folio 290 of the Lambeth Register.

The document is in Latin, and is, until the close, of usual form, save for lack of concords in the Latinity. This sequestration recites that 'the seal of the Venerable William Evans has been affixed by the Archbishop to the document, because the Seal of our Court of Audience is not to hand.'

Under what circumstances could the Seal of the Archbishop not be accessible, and the Seal of Evans ready for affixing?

On Friday, August 6, 1563, Parker was at Bekesbourne, near Canterbury, occupied with his birthday, his antiquarian pursuits, and with fear lest the plague might extend to his neighbourhood. He must have been irritable at somewhat, for he permitted himself to write quite a quantity of uncommon sarcasm to Cecil, directed against formularies too long for 'our cold devotions,' and too apt to lead to the neglect of the chancel as the proper place for intercessory prayer. From that date, until August 22nd, there is a gap in the records of Parker's existence, and it is this gap that the docu-

¹ Lambeth Register, f. 239.

ment of the eleventh, sealed with Evans' seal, fills. Where could it have been written? The Seal of the Court of Audience would not have been inaccessible at Canterbury. There also would be Dr. Clark's *Book of Precedents*, and in its furniture of forms little reason for the hasty inaccuracies of Latinity that distinguish the sequestration. Again, would Evans have journeyed to Canterbury, during the time of plague, and upon so trifling a matter? The tithes of the whole parish, of which William Gwynne was patron, amounted to fifteen and sixpence three farthings; not a large sum, even in those days, and scarcely sufficient for the expenses of the journey. If Evans had come, he would have needed to pass through London. From that city Parker would not have received Evans. He had refused to receive his old friend, Thirlby, even when sent by the Council, at a time of plague, when the visitor might have brought the infection from London.

On the face of the document, and of the circumstances of the time, it would seem improbable that Evans' seal was appended to the document at Canterbury.

Could the document have been penned at St. Fagan's, Evans' Vicarage in the Diocese of Llandaff, and executed by Parker there? The place was free from plague, and the journey there did not necessitate entry into London. Against such a solution is the distance. One hundred and sixty-five miles in five days would have necessitated good riding.¹

Upon occasion, even at this period, Parker was capable of riding in a single day a greater distance than the daily average necessary, but the lengthy journey would have been a worthy feat for a man who had just entered his sixtieth year. All that can be said is that the journey was not impossible. If Parker did, indeed, journey to Llandaff, the visit had not for its design the signature of a paltry document concerning fifteen shillings and sixpence three farthings.

Whether or no Parker journeyed to Llandaff, he certainly saw Evans, at this moment, when the death of Kitchen could not be far distant, and Parker formed of Evans the opinion that enabled that Chancellor to be long the administrator of the spiritual functions of the diocese, and, in effect, the successor of Kitchen.

The great conflict of 'competent authorities' upon the date of that death render a little discursion necessary. A footnote to Letters and

¹ The Commission to list Kitchen's goods shows that the double journey, to London and back to Llandaff, was accomplished in eight days.

Papers IV, Henry VIII, 3963, gives 1556 as the date of death. The rarity of errors in these vast compilations renders the detection of any slip uncommon pleasure. Le Neve gives, as the date of death, October 31, 1565 (*Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*). The restoration of Temporalities to Jones, Kitchen's successor, in March, 1566, mentions only Kitchen's antecedent 'natural death.' Upon March 18, 1564, Parker, writing to Cecil, mentions the desirability of filling the See of Llandaff, and of restoring to it the residence of the Bishop. Kitchen had, therefore, died before March, 1564. The date, November 6th, in the year 1563, and of Parker's consecration, as he correctly states, the fifth year—an accuracy that Evans was capable of knowing and appreciating—was that on which Parker handed over the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Diocese of Llandaff to Evans and to David Lewis, another of the same ultra-Catholic party. Parker carefully adds to the flattering good office towards Evans the archiepiscopal assurance, 'knowing his sound doctrine and purity of faith.' Since it was commonly rumoured that Evans had never conformed, and had not even received the Communion, according to the new rite,¹ Parker, possibly, was furnishing Evans with testimony that he could use on occasion. Parker certainly intended him for the bishopric of the see. This was known to Grindal, to whom Evans appeared only a dangerous recusant, whose designed promotion must be thwarted, even if such offensive was directed necessarily against the Metropolitan.

In December, 1563, Grindal wrote, injudiciously enough, to Cecil, Parker's confidant, and, meddling with the constitutional right of the Archbishop to advise the Crown, begged Cecil, 'if any suit be made for one Evans to be Bishop of Llandaff, to stay it.' Grindal recommended Coverdale, an octogenarian, recently much weakened by the plague, and ignorant of a word of Welsh.

From the general public, Kitchen's death was long concealed, and forgeries of his name, attached to deeds of gift, proceeded freely. His will was suppressed, and to this day, the place of its registration is unknown, although a passage in the will of Hugh Jones, successor in the diocese, shows that he had duly received his legacy thereunder. The will should have been registered in Parker's Registry, and the purpose of the concealment is obvious. The undoubted episcopacy of Kitchen was a major asset to a Church, the

¹ Chanc. Proc. Complaint of Reynold David, Bundle 55, no. 69, 1570-1573.

validity of whose Orders had been so bluntly disputed by Bonner and by Harding.

The failure to appoint a successor to the see for so many years is less explicable, unless the concealment could be managed in no other manner. If, as is very possible, Evans, or Jones, was a suffragan to Kitchen, the inconvenience that resulted was lessened.

In contrast to the concealment of Kitchen's death from foreign observers, ready to appreciate its significance, the haste with which it was communicated to the Crown was remarkable.

Even before Kitchen's burial, and on November 2, 1563, 'An Inventory of all the Goods and Chattels,' at Monk's Court, Matherne, where Kitchen had died, assured the Crown that not a book or manuscript, relating to any portion of his career, was in improper possession. The reader will learn hereafter that the Episcopal Register passed into the custody of Evans. The Inventory¹ was appraised, made and taken, by Robert Cooke, Richard Pratt, Philip Lawrence, and Watkin Lawrence, of the Parish of Matherne, and was lodged in the Court of Exchequer. In the Bishop's parlour were: two pair of almayne Ryvetts, three bills, a long pike, two bows, and three sheafs of arrows—such an armoury as befitted a Justice of the Peace. 'Almayn rivetts' may have been, as the *Oxford Dictionary* defines, German coats of mail, flexible by reason of the metals sliding on rivets; but, the term is frequently associated with arms offensive, not defensive, and might, conceivably, refer to cross-bows, in the construction of which a slide working over a rivet would have part. 'In my lord's study,' was an old cope, or, probably, copes, of blue, red, and green satin, from which it may be conjectured that the study was, in fact, an oratory.

In that study, apparently, he died, for his apparel is catalogued, to the use of the Queen, 'An old long gown of black satin, faced with caphew, an old chymere of worsted, two old caps, and an old silk hat.' The kitchen, from which hospitality to strangers could be exercised, and the needs of the household satisfied, was far better equipped, but the personal belongings are those of a man stripped to beggary, or satisfied with poverty.

Nothing in the list of the meagre belongings of Kitchen would tend to support the charges of avarice, or greed, brought against him.

Of his will, can be learnt that Hugh Jones, afterwards Bishop

¹ Exchequer Special Commission, 5 Eliz. 7048.

of Llandaff, who in his own will leaves to Evans, had received the silver spoons bequeathed under the will of 'Bishop Anthony.' Note the use of the mere Christian name, as of a Benedictine, or as of a familiar friend.

The house, Monk's Court, was taken over by the Crown. For its restoration to the see, ultimately accomplished, Parker made request to Cecil.

Kitchen was buried at Matherne Church. The absence of any reference to Mass vestments in the Inventory—and such there certainly were—may be attributed to his burial in an old set, and to the concealment of those brought out again for public use (to the indignation of the Bishop of Hereford) in the days of James I.¹

Hitherto, all that can be accredited to Kitchen, in motive and in act, has been faithfully recorded. Let the worst that Camden and Godwin on the Protestant side, or Sanders, Bishop White, and Aquila, on the Catholic side, be summed against him with every acerbity; let it be, that he plundered his see, without enriching himself, indulged his greed foully so that he possessed not even a change of raiment, that his ignorance was notorious, as shown by his degrees at two universities, and by his long tenure of the post of Principal of Gloucester College, let all this be; nay add the term, 'hoary old sinner,' used by the most vehement of his modern detractors, and does there not yet remain to be explained to his credit, or discredit, the singular fact of his retention of his see when nigh all other bishops vacated theirs?

Let us have this explanation at its possible worst, fling the mud (that will not stick) ourselves and see what that worst can be:

'The double cross of his episcopal arms surely symbolized Kitchen's conduct towards Catholicism and Protestantism.

'A sociable man can betray his friends;

'A married man, his wife;

'A father, his children;

'His children, their parents;

'What is left for a lonely celibate to betray?

'Only his ideals.'

And then—well, if he did; the necessity of the day, the disgust at what the Royal Supremacy had accomplished under Henry, Edward, and Mary, the death of Hooper, roasted slowly, of Ferrars, who had

¹ Verbal information communicated to the writer by late Right Rev. Fred. Geo. Lee, O.C.R., and Dom. State Papers.

loved man and beast, in the love of God, of such fanatics as Rawlins White, with whom Kitchen long argued and prayed, may all have induced him to bewildered compromise, that yet was not the sale of Christ by a Judas.

Kitchen revolted against the Royal Supremacy of Elizabeth from pure emotional Protestantism and self-will, and wished to remain an isolated Catholic. He became isolated, in all conscience, an Aunt Sally for the missiles of all parties, the conduct of his life left unexplained and nearly inexplicable—Kitchen refuse.

Such is the sum of unjust criticism.

Now for a summary, saner, kindlier, more consonant with recorded fact.

Kitchen, Cheney, and Guest, in their day, as Andrewes, and those of the Laudian school thereafter,¹ desired no separation from the great body of Christendom, firmly believed in the transmission of grace to a priesthood by episcopal ordination, and sought to plan what the Tractarian Movement actually achieved in the revival of doctrinal standards. These standards they found compatible with an interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Articles that Kitchen had declined to subscribe: an interpretation suggested within a century of his death, by that Franciscan Provincial who long laboured in the Diocese of Llandaff: Franciscus à Sancta Clara.²

Kitchen, who preceded these revivals, planned not restoration but retention; in especial the retention of indubitable episcopacy, in the person of a bishop, uncondemned and unexcommunicate. In this, he succeeded amazingly, but, in securing the transmission of an indubitable episcopate, failed, notoriously.³ And, by his failure, he must be judged. No man may step from the path of known secure procedure, save with the certainty of regaining it, with that which he has rescued at the peril of his soul. A man may, on the Sabbath Day, seek to get an ass from a pit, but not prudently at the risk of mutilating the ass, and destroying himself.

The verdict of man must be that Kitchen erred gravely in judgement, and wrought but futility, so far as the known events of his

¹ Laud's followers were clearer as to their desires than Laud himself, who declared that he died in 'the Protestant faith.'

² A reading of the *Paraphrastica Expositio Articulorum Confessionis Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, London, 1646, or its re-edited matter, in Dr. F. G. Lee's edition of 1866, will show to what extent Tract 90 was indebted to the careful work of Sancta Clara.

³ Notoriously; since an indubitable fact is not one that is believed firmly by some, but that cannot be doubted by any.

day showed fruition of his works. The verdict of God is based on larger knowledge.

As has been seen, Parker's confidence in the integrity of faith of Evans, the Chancellor of the Diocese, enabled the functions spiritual to be invested in this suspect-Papist. Parker even sought his nomination as successor to Kitchen.

Evans concerned himself with the most practical courses. He secured Kitchen's Episcopal Register, and refused to yield it, even at the cost of a law suit.

It will be recalled that, in or about 1551, John Griffiths, then Treasurer of Llandaff, and accomplice of the Reformers engaged in the plunder of the see, had succeeded, or had stated that he had succeeded, in obtaining for himself, and his nephew John Lloyd, a grant to be Registrar of the Acts of the Bishop and of the Bishop's Chancellor, the Vicar in Spirituality General, the Commissary of the Bishop and his successors, and of the acts of the King's ecclesiastical power.

Griffiths, whose complicity in plunder, the Cathedral clergy avouched, in the days of Mary, stayed in England, conformed to the Roman régime, and made his will in the last days of the Queen's reign. He survived until the accession of Elizabeth, and died, probably, at Salisbury, where he held some preferment. He claimed the Deanery of St. Asaph. His will, which omits the regnal year of Mary, and thus her titles, contains no bequest for Masses, and very limited expressions of piety, which would, indeed, have been strangely out of place. His sole executor was John Lloyd of All Souls College, Oxford, his nephew, and the overseer of the will was Herbert, Earl of Pembroke. The witnesses were Roger Rawlings, once a notorious Reformer, who appears to have conformed, and Robert Goldsmyth, both described as priests. The probate was singularly dated—February 31, 1559.

At a time, conjectured by the Calendars of the Record Office as between 1570 and 1579, but which, as internal evidence shows, was between 1563 and these possible later dates, Reginald David, described as servant unto the Earl of Pembroke,¹ filed a Bill in Chancery, demanding of Evans the surrender of Kitchen's Episcopal Register.² The Leicesters, Sidneys, and Pembroke, were no friends

¹ The term 'servant' is frequently used of the serjeant-at-law, who accomplished the legal work of the great of the realm.

² Chanc. Proc., Bundle 55, no. 69, 1570-1579.

of Parker, or of Cecil, and the surrender might have inconvenienced more persons than Evans.

The allegation extended further. The deed of grant, on which the complaint was founded, was in the possession of Evans, though how or why was never explained.

Evans replied in his accustomed form. He neither affirmed nor denied his possession of the grant of the string of spiritual faculties suggested, but states that he is the Chancellor of the Diocese, and explains his possession of the Episcopal Register in a simple, manly, and straightforward fashion—that he needs it.

He also explained how he got it. He sent to Reginald David for it; when David was not at home. David's 'concubine,' Jennett Griffiths, was complaisant, and handed it over.

The term 'concubine,' which Evans would, probably, have applied to the wife of any cleric, was, of course, indignantly repudiated. David explained that Janet Griffiths was his wife. No doubt, he admits, Evans needed the Register, he needed it 'to hide his Popish delinquencies.'

The suggestion that Parker's delegate, the Chancellor of an Anglican diocese, could be a Papist must have cut Evans to the quick, to have evoked the astounding reply he made.

He asseverated solemnly that, since the accession of Queen Elizabeth (note, not since the Act of Uniformity) he had forborne Papistry, and had even received the Communion of the Established Church—though with what liturgy he did not state.

That a high official of a diocese could reply in a manner, so astoundingly impudent, that he reserved his Papistry to his private conscience, and had, apparently once,¹ participated on one of its functions, concludes this record of the state of the See of Llandaff.

And, if the reader has perused to this point, he may already have concluded that the case first set out has been abundantly proved, and that nothing remains to the author but to record his thanks: *Imprimis* to the Most Reverend the Lords Archbishops of Canterbury, 1892–1939, for ample facilities afforded for inspecting the Lambeth Register, to the Corporation of Cardiff, to the Catholic Record Society, and to the Editor of *Notes and Queries*, for the generous permission to extract from their copyrights, and, with no less gratitude, to the Rev. L. Hicks, S.J., and to the Rev. Albert

¹ Perhaps at the consecration of Bp. Hugh Jones. No one asked how else he had communicated.

Peel, editor of the *Congregational Quarterly*, who successively read the manuscript of this book and provided valuable suggestions for its improvement, and to the printers and the readers of the proofs, who, undeterred by the condition of bombed manuscript, have rendered readable the intricate tale of sixteenth-century muddle, vacillation, and spiritual glaucoma. To those readers, Mr. E. Minifie and Mr. D. C. Summers, the thanks, not only of myself, but of any who derive aught of profit from the perusal, are due.

Salve, O carissime lector.

THE CATECHISM OF PROOF

THE questions as to the acts of Anthony Kitchen with regard to the consecration of Parker by him on the last Sunday in October, 1559, may be submitted as follows:

(i) Was Parker in London on that date? *Jewel says so, and styles him, thereafter, 'Archbishop' and not 'Archbishop-Elect.'*

(ii) Had Kitchen been ordered to effect any Act at that date? *Yes, the consecration of Parker, by Letters Patent.*

(iii) Did any penalty attach to refusal, or neglect? *Yes; the penalties of Praemunire.*

(iv) Was any penalty applied to him? *No, he was treated with marked favour, and courtesy.*

(v) Were the penalties remitted, because of his compliance in other respects? *No, he refused the Oath of Supremacy.*

(vi) Did any official, contemporaneous, documents record the Act? *Yes, Sanders' letters, now in the Vatican MSS.*

(vii) From what date does Parker himself account his years of consecration? *From October, 1559, and not from December 17, 1559.*

(viii) Do his registrars refer to any consecration of Parker prior to December 17, 1559? *Both Walter Haddon and Thomas Argall refer to his consecration and confirmation as effected, prior to that date.*

(ix) Who were these men? *His proper registrars affirming rights derived from Parker's consecration and confirmation, and their statements are legal evidence of the facts they record.*

(x) Is Parker's consecration, as recorded in the Lambeth Register; not legally evidenced in like manner? *No, it was not, at any period during his life, produced from proper custody when challenged, and its compilation does not profess to be contemporaneous with the events recorded.*

(xi) Does any conclusive internal evidence prove its untrustworthiness? *Yes; it records, with detail, an impossible event, the consecration, by Parker, of Hugh Curwen, who had been Archbishop of Dublin. Parker in his letters expressly denies that he had consecrated Curwen.*

(xii) Did the upholders of Anglican status suggest a consecration by Kitchen? *Yes, Cecil affirmed solemnly to De Quadra that Parker's*

consecration was not only valid but canonical, and Kitchen and Stanley were the only diocesan bishops, not deprived.

(xiii) What steps were taken to prevent public knowledge of the facts of Parker's consecration? *Kitchen's Register was removed, his will suppressed, and his death concealed.*

(xiv) If the consecration by Kitchen is admitted, what difference is made as to the controversy concerning Anglican Orders? *The objections, founded upon the rite, used from 1562-1662, remain. The historical objection to acknowledgement of the validity of Barlow's episcopate becomes unimportant.*

(xv) Of what use other than antiquarian discovery is the proof worth? *Much. The Church that alleges Divine Authority, sacramentally transmitted, is devoided of its claim, if the transmission alleged by that Church is demonstrated, unprovable and doubtful, in the manner that Church asserts.*

Theological Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California